

Pastor and People



Letters to a Young Preacher

By

THEODORE GRAEBNER



ST. LOUIS, MO.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE

1932

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Copyright, 1932
by
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
St. Louis, Mo.

A LETTER TO THE READER.

Since contributing to the 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922 volumes of the *Homiletic Magazine* a number of "Letters to a Young Preacher," I have often been requested to republish them in book form or to write a new series. The conditions under which we do our work as a Church suffers continuous change, and new problems arise, so that I did not bring the request for republication to the publisher. However, there has been in recent years an accumulation of carbon copies in my files which to those who have caught glimpses of them appear to possess a more general interest. Acting upon these suggestions and requests, I have culled out a small number of letters from those now collected in my editorial office and have given them to the printer.

These letters, then, are chips from an editorial workshop and should be judged as such. They are not essays or disquisitions which presume to treat exhaustively the various topics which are mentioned in the captions. In a few of them you may discover the originals of contributions made to the *Lutheran Witness*, — although they here still have the subjective coloring which necessarily was lost when they were rewritten for our official organ. There are possibly five or six of these. Most of the letters are here reprinted exactly as written — unretouched negatives that possibly make up in practical directness what they lack in literary artistry.

The painstaking work of my colleague Prof. E. J. Friedrich, who revised the manuscript, is gratefully acknowledged.

In one respect there is nothing new in these letters. Doctrinally they represent the stand of our Lutheran Confessions. In their practical application of Scripture they do not claim to offer anything startlingly novel. Where they touch on matters undecided in the Scriptures, the opinions in these letters, and the advice given, reflect the evangelical stand of the fathers of our Synod. Few of them would have been written without the contacts formed through my editorial work. Readers of our church-papers can hardly have an adequate conception of the correspondence which an official editorship involves.

The letters selected for the present volume have been taken out of the files 1920—1930. Friends who have read the originals from which the manuscript was copied have been kind enough to say that not only ministers, — the original recipients, — but also our laymen will find pleasure and comfort in reading them. If this should prove to be the case and through the 112 letters here reprinted a few brethren will be strengthened in their endeavor to regulate personal affairs as well as congregational matters by the rule of the Word of God and according to the dictates of a well-instructed conscience, the author will have achieved his purpose.

St. Louis, May 17, 1932.

TH. G.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

I. "DO THE WORK OF AN EVANGELIST."	PAGE
1. The Minister's Expectancy of Life	1
2. System	3
3. The "Should" and "Must" in Gospel Admonition	3
4. Memory Courses	7
5. Book Report for Conference	7
6. Confirming Another Pastor's Parishioner	8
7. Burial of Unbelievers	9
8. Officiating at the Funeral of a Worldling	10
9. The Secret of the Confessional	11
10. In Doubt about a Call	11
11. Returning the Call	12
12. Ready to Resign	14
13. A Deadlock on Baptism	16
14. A Grudge of Long Standing	16
15. Trouble of a Member with a Former Pastor	17
16. Troublesome Member	18
17. A Case for Charity	19
18. Teacher Has Property in Another City	21
19. Proselytizing	22
20. Joint Advertising	23
21. Congregation of Another Lutheran Body Applies for Services	24
22. An Invitation from the Ministerial Alliance	25
23. Selling Christmas Seals to Outsiders	27
24. Community Fund	28
25. A Soldiers' Memorial Service	28
26. Community Christmas	29
27. Reform Movements and Social Righteousness	30
28. Labor Sunday	32
29. The Lodge and Christianity	34

	PAGE
30. The Lord's Prayer and the Lodge Prayers	37
31. Campbellite Baptism	39
32. Episcopalians	39
33. Seventh-day Adventism Christian?	40
34. Puritans and Pilgrims	42

II. IN THE FIELD OF DOCTRINE.

1. The Intolerance of the Gospel	45
2. Will Strictness Kill Our Church?	46
3. Theology and Science	49
4. Stumbling-blocks to Faith	49
5. Genesis 1 and the Geological Periods	51
6. For Whom Are the Ten Commandments?	52
7. Baptizing the Child of an Excommunicated Person	53
8. Introduction of Individual Communion Cup	53
9. Wine or Grape-juice?	57
10. Bread in Holy Communion	59
11. Self-communion	60
12. Woman Teachers in Our Conferences	60
13. The Second Blessing and the Unsaved	61
14. Can a Lutheran be Saved in a Methodist Church?	63
15. Mingling Church and State	65
16. Bible-reading in the Public Schools	66
17. Witchcraft To-day	67
18. God Reconciled to Us or We Reconciled to God?	70
19. The Believer's Soul after Death	71
20. Historical Proof for the Resurrection	72
21. Predestination	73
22. The "Non-elect"	75
23. Did He Commit the Unpardonable Sin?	78

III. BIBLICAL PROBLEMS.

1. The Animals in Noah's Ark	88
2. Difficulty in the Law of Sacrifice	88
3. Saul in the Cave of Endor	90

Table of Contents.

VII

	PAGE
4. Sacraments Old and New	90
5. Miracles	91
6. The Pool Bethesda	95
7. Three Would-be Disciples, Luke 9, 57—62	96
8. Signs of the Second Advent	96
9. The "To-day" of Jesus on the Cross	99
10. May Women Attend Church with Uncovered Heads? ...	99
11. Faith-healing	100
12. Inspiration of Non-apostolic Writings	102

IV. PROBLEMS IN ETHICS.

1. Is Every Untruth a Lie?	109
2. Life Insurance	109
3. Life Insurance, Labor Unions, Professional Baseball	112
4. A School Picnic on Sunday Morning	113
5. Sunday Work	114
6. Charity and Inspector's Job	115
7. A Raffle	115
8. Masking at Parties	116
9. Bobbed Hair	116
10. Jewelry and Cosmetics	117
11. Hypnotism	117
12. A Case of Incest	119
13. "Looking upon a Woman"	120
14. Sex Education	121

V. CONGREGATIONAL LIFE.

1. Woman's Place in the Congregation	125
2. Votes for Women	126
3. A Lady President of the Y. P. S.	128
4. A Woman Sunday-school Superintendent	128
5. Overorganized?	129
6. The Young People's Society	130
7. Bazaars	132
8. The Band is Invited to a Methodist Picnic	134

	PAGE
9. Naming a Cemetery	135
10. Congregational Offices	136
11. The Language Question	138
12. Resigning from the Congregation	139
13. Resigning from Voting Membership	139
14. A Case of Excommunication	139
15. Publishing a List of Contributors	141
16. "He Can Afford It!"	143

VI. LITURGICAL INCIDENTS.

1. Churchly Churches	146
2. Extemporaneous Prayer	147
3. The Liturgical Use of Amen	150
4. Apostrophe "S"	151
5. Pulpit Announcements	151
6. The "Obey" in Our Marriage Formulary	152
7. Religious Pageants	152
8. Dramatizing the Christmas-story	154
9. Vested Choirs	154
10. Joining Non-Lutheran Singing Organizations	155
11. Sacred Music and Christian Fellowship	158
12. Church Choir Practises for Secular Entertainment during Lent	160
13. A Function of Ushers	161

I.

"DO THE WORK OF AN EVANGELIST."

1. THE MINISTER'S EXPECTANCY OF LIFE.

I have not at hand the most recent statistics, but some ten years ago the average length of life in the ministerial profession was sixty-two years, the highest by far of any profession or occupation. But you ask how we shall account for this well-known longevity of ministers. As you put it, "How is it that the worries incidental to, and indeed inseparable from, the ministerial calling do not kill off the greater number of its incumbents in the prime of life?"

I am well aware of the fact that the life of the pastor has not only the usual share of worries caused by illness, accident, reverses of fortune, and slimness of purse, but that there is a constant drain upon the mental and nervous strength of the pastor by reason of the special cares of his office as minister to souls and as public preacher. The conscientious pastor — and by far the greater number of pastors are conscientious — is burdened not only during periods of stress in congregational life, but at all times with anxieties such as are unknown in any other profession. His life is one long, unbroken chain of spiritual cares, spiritual stress, and spiritual crises, the result of the overwhelming responsibilities imposed by the care of souls. He knows that on the Last Day he will have to give an account of his work, whether he has been faithful in breaking to young and old the Bread of Life. No member of the flock can stray into the paths of sin or of indifference but the pastor's heart is burdened with agonizing fears for the ultimate fate of those wandering away from the narrow path. Add to this the mental strain imposed by the weekly

sermon work and the many physical hardships incidental to the work in most parishes. The question therefore is justified, Why do not more pastors succumb to the strain? How is it that the great majority of them live to a green old age and, as averages go, live far beyond the usual expectancy of life?

It is clear that over against the wearing cares of the minister's life there must be a vast compensating force which not only repairs the inroads made upon health and strength through daily worries, but far in excess of such losses supplies a power that carries its recipient beyond the ordinary span of allotted years. There must be some hidden source of strength, a continuous inflow of nervous and mental power, a constant process of repair which is fed from some great reservoir of courage, and determination, and good cheer, and faith.

That hidden well-spring of youth and vigor is the Word of God. It is the peace of God that passeth all understanding, which remains unshaken, at its center through all the storms of life. There is the secret of that mending process which lengthens life. Signal proof here of the literal truth—taken literally by our Lord when He quoted it in the great Temptation—of the prophet's words: "Man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live," Deut. 8, 3.

There are other factors that contribute to the high average length of life among ministers. As a rule, they lead a fairly active life, especially when they do missionary work in their parish and faithfully visit their sick and those who must be admonished. Also, they are, as a rule, free from the vices of indulgence in rich foods or of excessive use of liquor. A large percentage live in the country and in small towns, where life is not as fast and hectic as in

the large cities. Yet I believe that the strongest factor is the continuous application of the Gospel preacher to the Word of God. Do we not sing in the German hymn: "*Dein Wort macht LEIB und Seel' gesund*"?

2. SYSTEM.

How I find time to do all my writing? I work slowly, but do things only once. I do all work by dictation, but never dictate a letter or article a second time. Very little of it is by my own choice, and as long as the public does not get tired of it, I keep on writing. You may not know that my correspondence entails much more work than what goes to the printer.

3. THE "SHOULD" AND "MUST" IN GOSPEL ADMONITION.

In your text-book on homiletics you write about "Gospel admonition." "Young ministers are apt to multiply 'you should,' etc. . . . Such sentences are frequently found in students' sermons: 'And the Lord WANTS us to be thankful for the gifts.' . . . Very true; but this is laying down the Law where Christians ought to be admonished through the Gospel."

Now, I do not know what to make of such sentences as "Christ lag in Todesbanden, Fuer unsre Suend' gegeben, Der ist wieder erstanden Und hat uns bracht das Leben. Des wir SOLLEN froehlich sein, Gott loben und dankbar sein." (German hymn-book, No. 99, 1.) The motive for righteousness, "loben und danken," is Christ's work of redemption; but why the "des wir sollen"? Would you call the English version of this hymn preferable: "Therefore LET US all rejoice"?

I am inclined to believe that such words as "should," "must," etc., if they are not stressed into law, are not out of place when the motive for righteousness has been

properly stated. *Formula Concordiae* (Mueller, p. 532, 3. 4): "Wir glauben, lehren und bekennen auch, dass alle Menschen, sonderlich aber die durch den Heiligen Geist wiedergeboren und erneuert, SCHULDIG sein, gute Werke zu tun."

Now comes the difficulty for me. When I compare such examples with "Young ministers are apt to multiply 'you should,' etc.," then I do not know what to make of it and, naturally enough, do not know exactly how to express myself when writing a sermon. Do you mean to lay the stress on multiply—young ministers are apt to multiply?

This matter may be simple enough, but it troubles me. Prof. P. read one of my sermons and said there was a legal tone in it. Therefore I must be very, very careful.

Is the divine call unto holiness really a Gospel admonition? I have heard ministers speak of it as Law.

Would you condemn this sentence: "Der liebe Gott hat uns das helle Licht des Evangeliums gegeben. Wem aber ein Licht gegeben ist, dem ist es nicht gegeben, damit er es schnell verberge, sondern er soll andern damit leuchten. So erwartet Gott von uns und verlangt, dass wir andern leuchten sollen mit dem hellen Licht des Evangeliums"?

You are concerned about the use of the auxiliaries "should" and "shall" in sermons containing Gospel admonition. As you will observe, when rereading my *Expository Preacher*, I, p. 84, it is not the use of the auxiliaries that the young preacher must be warned against,—in the sentences recommended as examples of a better form you notice that I have used "should,"—but its use in such a manner that the hearer receives the impression that Christianity were a set of laws and that, if these are obeyed by him, then he is a Christian, but if he does not live up to them fully, he is not a Christian. The danger is very real. I have occasion continually to correct students' ser-

mons in this respect. Certainly, "we must," "we ought," "we should," "we must not," etc., are all permissible; but whenever a student says "you must," "a Christian should," he manages to give the sentence a *Beigeschmack* of Law, which is not proper in a sermon that is intended to help the hearer, *i. e.*, the Christian hearer, to sanctify his life. Certainly, calling men to holiness is Gospel admonition, not Law. The Law is preached to reveal sin, to cause repentance through knowledge of sin, not to help people lead Christian lives; — that is possible only through the Gospel, *i. e.*, Gospel admonition, as in the many examples I quote from the epistles in the foregoing pages of my book. If you are imbued with the spirit of these passages, you need no formulation of any theory. (That is the reason I called my book, in its first edition, *Inductive Homiletics*.) Do not worry your head about definitions. Learn from the Scriptures and imitate the apostles. You cannot possibly go wrong. When you preach the Law, you preach to the flesh of the Christian, which is wholly evil and must hear the sentence of condemnation. Then you preach the Gospel, which works spiritual life, repentance, faith. Then you preach Gospel admonition, like in the texts quoted from Paul. I have purposely refrained from giving any direction how this is to be done. I have quoted the passages, printed them out, and now, if you study them, and the passages similar to these in the New Testament epistles and in Acts, you cannot possibly fail.

The sentence you quote, "*Der liebe Gott*," etc., is all right. If that line of argument only is followed out in the sermon, it is not sufficient for the purpose. Certainly we should do all these things you mention. But why? Because — well, all I can say, read the passages I quote in my manual. Those reasons must be urged on the Christian. (See summary on p. 83.) The whole matter is exceedingly

simple, not in the least complicated. Have you Bente's *Gesetz und Evangelium*? Read paragraphs 11, 22, 25, 27, and 31; they state the principles with utter clearness. Of course, I know that young preachers find difficulty here, but they do so only because they do not apply what the Scripture so plainly teaches through the example of the admonitions contained in the epistles.

Do not despair of your ability on this or any other point of sermon-making. You cannot acquire all the art of preaching in a few years. The principles are simple enough, so simple that five years hence you will not understand how you ever could discover any difficulty in applying them; but the way to learn is simply to follow out the suggestions which we have from the Holy Spirit Himself. As for losing courage, there is no reason whatever. We all had to pass through those stages. You know that our Christian theology is as much a matter of life as of teaching; both together make the theologian and pastor. I believe that you will receive all that you pray for.

NOTE.—The paragraphs referred to in the above letter from the author's book *The Expository Preacher* are found in a discussion of Gospel admonition as an ingredient of Christian preaching. The motives which Scripture supplies for exhortation unto holiness are the appeals on the basis of divine mercy and of the exalted privilege of being a Christian and the glories of heaven in store for him. Then follows this caution: "Young ministers are apt to multiply 'you should,' 'you must,' 'you ought to,' when they should appeal through 'let us,' 'should we not,' etc. Such sentences as these are frequently found in students' sermons: 'And the Lord wants us to be thankful for the gifts He bestowed upon us, and He wants evidence for our thankfulness, evidence that amounts to more than merely going to church every Sunday or on Thanksgiving Day; He wants us to return to Him some of the temporal gifts He has given us; He wants us to give freely for the upbuilding of the kingdom of God on earth.' Very true; but this is laying down the Law where Christians ought to be admonished through the Gospel: 'Oh, let us be truly

grateful for the gifts bestowed upon us out of His fatherly hand! And should such evidence of our gratitude not amount to more than merely going to church every Sunday, etc.? Ought we not to return freely some of the temporal gifts, etc.?"

4. MEMORY COURSES.

I have never heard of any one that has ever been benefited by a course in mnemotechnics training. Every one of these systems has in it some grain of usefulness which is emphasized in the advertising literature, but the great difficulty in following out such a system as you mention in your letter is the lack of time. I believe the memorizing of sermons regularly every week is the best system of mnemonics ever devised. I have heard people speak highly of such systems as David Roth's; but it is a strange thing that those who recommend such courses were not products of the system, but invariably possessed naturally an excellent memory. This factor must be taken into account when you read the glowing tributes to the various systems on the market. A naturally sluggish memory may become active and responsive through years of regular memorizing.

5. BOOK REPORT FOR CONFERENCE.

My conference has asked me to give a review of Schweitzer's "The Mysticism of St. Paul." Some hints as to how I should go at my task would be welcome. I have only two weeks to do this work.

One cannot do justice to such a book as you mention in the short time that is at your disposal. However, if the brethren will make allowance for a somewhat sketchy performance, this is the mode of procedure that will yield at least a survey of Schweitzer's volume: Work with the table of contents, if that indicates the line of argument; also with the index. Rapid reading of the book. Select two

groups of facts: those illustrating the main position of the author and those in which we agree with him. If there is nothing positively good to be said about the book, point out the fundamental disagreements with Scripture. If you find any statements of fact (historical, archeological, etc.) that are a real contribution to our knowledge of the Bible, make a list of these.

Sometimes a review thus hurriedly conceived will turn out better because of its spontaneity than a more labored and thorough production.

6. CONFIRMING ANOTHER PASTOR'S PARISHIONER.

The question has arisen in our conference whether or not the rite of confirmation makes the one confirmed a member of the congregation in which he or she is confirmed. There are two cases which have given rise to the discussion. In the one case I was asked to confirm a girl belonging to a neighboring minister's congregation. I claim that the girl became a member of my congregation by confirmation and that she ought to have a letter of transfer to his congregation in order to become a member there. He is of the opinion that confirmation does not mean anything of that sort and that she needs no release from my congregation. In the other case involved, a family in W. left the congregation there and joined my neighbor's congregation in E. L. The family has a daughter who is not confirmed. She has been reading for confirmation in W. and wants to be confirmed in W. But now, after reading with the pastor in W. for about one and a half years, the pastor of W. refuses to confirm her until she has been released from the congregation in E. L. My contention is that he has such release in the permission granted by the parents and the pastor of E. L. congregation and that by confirmation she becomes a member of the W. congregation.

My contention is that confirmation in the Lutheran Church is regarded as a preparation for the first Communion and is therefore a preparation for communicant membership with a congregation, because it is in and through the authority vested in the congregation that the privileges of communicant membership are enjoyed. He seems to have different notions and will not admit that confirmation makes the one confirmed a member of the congregation in which the confirmation is performed. The very form of the confirmation certificate makes this plain, to my notion.

The natural presumption is that a person newly confirmed thereby becomes a member of the confirming pastor's congregation. If, however, the understanding has been that the person confirmed shall be considered a temporary resident only, there would not be any need of a letter of transfer after the confirmation. This would apply, for instance, when young people go to the city for work and then are confirmed, or when they are in town to attend a high school, a business college, etc. It would apply, too, without change of residence if a Norwegian pastor confirms a member of a neighboring Swedish or German congregation. The instruction and confirmation performed in all such cases would be regarded as done by authority delegated by the congregation and pastor with whom the catechumen has been united in membership.

7. BURIAL OF UNBELIEVERS.

To officiate at the funeral of one who has despised the Word of God during his lifetime is wrong unless we can say that the deceased had earnestly repented. Otherwise, to give such a one the honor of a Christian burial cannot fail to impress unbelievers with the notion that, after all, our relation to the Church does not matter much; all who

have tried their best, have been sincere, etc., will "go to the same place." This will be the necessary result if the funeral sermon makes the impression that the deceased has probably gone to heaven. To preach the Law, *i. e.*, to quote the deceased as an example of those who despise grace and are lost, would be perfectly permissible, of course; but who wants such a funeral sermon? Now, the former kind of sermon will confirm people in unbelief; the other kind they do not want. There are other reasons why a faithful preacher will not officiate at the burial of an unbeliever, but these will suffice.

The case which you mention in your letter has no reference to one who has openly despised the Word of God. In such a case we give the deceased the benefit of the doubt and preach a sermon which says little about his life or death, except that we express the hope that he was saved. The sermon would be along more general Gospel lines.

8. OFFICIATING AT THE FUNERAL OF A WORLDLING.

Matt. 8, 22 has been, and still frequently is, quoted to prove that it is contrary to Scripture for a pastor to officiate at the funeral of one whom we cannot regard as one who died in the Lord. Now, I fully uphold the principle that such an act of a pastor would be inconsistent. As a faithful pastor he preaches that Jesus is the only Way to life, and by officiating at the funeral of an unbeliever, by giving him a Christian burial, he would repudiate his former testimony. But that is not the issue. Can Matt. 8, 22 be rightfully quoted to prove our position?

The text referred to in your letter cannot be quoted in proof for the position that it is unscriptural for a Christian pastor to officiate at the funeral of worldlings. Surely the pastor who lends himself to such a purpose prostitutes his

holy office. But the text Matt. 8, 22 does not bear on this question at all. The disciple did not ask for permission to officiate at the funeral of his father. He simply asks Jesus to suffer him first to go and bury his father, *i. e.*, to bring his body to its last resting-place. Jesus tells him, "Follow Me, and let the dead bury their dead." Don't let earthly duties keep you from following Me. These earthly duties can be performed even by those who are spiritually dead, but obedience to the call "Follow Me" cannot be postponed to some convenient time in the future.

9. THE SECRET OF THE CONFESSIONAL.

In his book on *American Civil Church Law*, page 333, Zollmann says that a minister cannot be compelled to bear witness at a trial if anything was communicated to him as pastor. Such information is considered privileged like that given to a lawyer, who can never be called upon to testify against his client. Zollmann does not treat the case which you mention of preventing some calamity by publishing a secret. But the law makes no distinction between things confessed to the minister. Therefore it would seem that the law cannot penalize in any way the minister's silence regarding what he has heard in confession.

10. IN DOUBT ABOUT A CALL.

You ask my advice in regard to your call to W. While I should prefer to know more about the congregation as also about the call from a mission which you expect to receive this week, the fact that you feel yourself wholly unfit for the work at W. is to me no reason for advising you to refuse. However, I should very much hesitate to accept a call which will require my teaching school if a congregation numbers 530 souls and is wealthy. Our synodical papers have time and again admonished our congregations to call regular teachers as soon as they are

financially able. I do not say that a pastor may not be an efficient schoolteacher and at the same time a good preacher, but with forty children in school and a great number of States right now considering legislation that affects our schools, also certification of teachers and inspection, I think it is time that a congregation be told that it cannot expect to get a minister unless it gives him free hand for pastoral work and at the same time safeguards the interest of its school by calling a regular teacher. I do not know what I should advise if I knew all the facts in the case, but on the basis of your letter I should say: Return the call and inform those who sent you the call that a congregation of 530 souls will require your entire time, so that you would have to neglect either the school or your pastoral duties. Such a letter should be written in the kindest tone and without any sharpness. Of course, if the prospects are that the congregation should soon call a teacher, this objection to accepting the call would not hold.

Bring this matter to your Lord in prayer, consult with Rev. B., and then make your own decision.

11. RETURNING THE CALL.

My congregation has called a teacher, and he has declined the call. Some members believe that the call should be returned because it is to be expected that a "good man" will not accept a call when it is offered the first time. What do you say?

If your candidate has declined the call offered to him, that should settle the matter. This business of sending a call the second time has recently been overdone; it has become an epidemic. Congregations and some electoral boards are quite candid about it. When they call a teacher or a minister or a professor, they at once instruct a sub-

committee to "return the call" (send it a second time) if it is declined. I have also seen some letters which on their surface were letters of declination, but which between the lines plainly said that the writer would be found willing if called a second time. It has become so ugly a situation that a man who follows the dictates of conscience by accepting a call offered to him, a first call, stands in an unenviable light, as if too eagerly grasping at the opportunity. Congregational committees are apt to shake their heads and ask themselves: "Why does the man accept so fast? Has he had trouble with his congregation? We'll see, but it looks bad. The man worth anything will wait until he gets the call a second time." Likewise accepting a call to one of our colleges when offered the first time has been subject to the same misunderstanding.

When we remember that a congregational call begins with a prayer to Almighty God and ends with the sincere hope of a favorable answer, it seems to me almost sacrilegious to "play" with such a call. Yet I know of congregations that offered a salary of, say, \$150 a month, with the tacit understanding that, when the call is declined, they will raise it to \$175. Surely no minister or teacher wants to be placed into a position of bidding for a higher salary by sending a call back. Is it not clear that ministers, teachers, and professors, also prospective professors, who decline a call "on principle" when it comes the first time, as well as congregations and electoral boards that support such a "principle," are making the innocent suffer, both those who accept the call when first offered and those who have good reasons for accepting it when offered a second time? It is self-evident that this does not rule out every possibility of offering a call twice or even three times to the same person. Possibly through an oversight some salient reason that was to be urged was omitted from the

call. Or conditions may have arisen that now make it doubly desirable to call this candidate and no other. In other words, the situation has changed. In such cases repeating a call may be entirely in order. However, the rule should be that the congregation or board issuing the diploma of vocation states beyond the possibility of misunderstanding the reasons for the candidate's selection, offers all the inducements first that might be offered last, invites personal conference for discussion of the call, if necessary, and after that accepts every declination when it comes, no matter how worded, as final. Assuming that all these conditions have been fulfilled, I say once more, regard the refusal of your candidate as final.

12. READY TO RESIGN.

I can well understand your frame of mind. You are convinced that, "if you had known what treatment one has to expect from leaders in the congregation, you would never have entered the ministry." But while such moods are natural, they must not control your conduct. And as for leaving the ministry, that thought should be put away as a temptation (*Anfechtung*) of the devil.

What you are getting now is an intensified preparation for future work in the ministry. This is a schooling through which every minister must go. We have all had such periods. And in spite of that we must not lose faith in our people. They often mean well when they seem to oppose us for personal reasons or none at all.

Just greet these people in the most friendly manner. You can do that without dissembling because you are naturally friendly and affable. So do not act contrary to your nature, as if you were bitter or vengeful. A smile, a strong handshake, will go a far way.

Make sure that you are doing what the Lord wants;

that you are not leaving people whose guide and shepherd He wants you to be regardless of the conditions which prevail. It is never a safe thing to do things in a depressed mood. Low spirits are not normal with a Christian; he may feel that way, but it is not a normal feeling for those who have the promise of the Spirit, whose work it is to give us joy and happiness. Act according to those moods in which you can say that the flesh has a minimum and the spirit a maximum of influence. You will not go wrong then. I certainly do not blame you for feeling all ambition oozing out of you, for feeling tired of a situation which shows no prospect of mending. But it is a great thing to do your duty in spite of setbacks. Not only is it the worldly-wise thing to keep a cheerful countenance towards your people even after they have refused your reasonable request, but it is the Christian thing to do. You will win out if you do all things with a smile. A bright look and cheerful countenance will be a wonderful asset in your profession as a preacher.

I do not blame you for being low in spirits and for having no great incentive to sermon-making. Nevertheless your call is just as valid as when you first received it, and you should give your people the best sermons of which you are capable. You are not so sure that you will move away from M., as I have said before. There is a saying: *Die Suppe wird nicht so heiss gegessen, wie sie gekocht wird.* You may find the people in a conciliatory mood. This should be your own attitude anyway. If you must look for another call, you must give them no cause for claiming that you forced the issue. Please do not forget one thing: Ask yourself in all seriousness what shortcomings you have had that may have contributed to the result. Only after a real searching of your own heart will you be in a frame of mind which seeks only the good of the Church. Harbor

no resentment, however much cause you might find for that. Don't resign. It may be that you are already over the worst. And you have some good friends at M. Above all, you have a Savior, who forgives you your mistakes and who will uphold you in every trial. Is it not wonderful to know that?

13. A DEADLOCK ON BAPTISM.

In our town we have an X Synod church and a Missouri Synod church. The husband is a member of the one church, and his wife is a member of the other church. They have one child. The father demands that his daughter should be baptized in his church; the mother demands that the daughter be baptized in her church. The two pastors of the churches do not agree; one claims that the father is right in his demand; the other maintains that the mother is right in her demand. Which of the two is right?

You do not say whether the husband or the wife is your party. Whichever it is, let him or her try to persuade her or him to permit the child to be baptized by you. If the other party does not yield, advise your party to yield rather than permit the child to go unbaptized any longer.

14. A GRUDGE OF LONG STANDING.

A man in my congregation, twenty years ago, was fined \$50 in a local court. He holds this to have been an injustice. Ever since that time he has not bid the official who fined him good day on the street. This is not hearsay, but he told me this himself. He did not fight the case, but paid the fine, and so the case did not go to court. My question is: How am I to deal with him regarding the Lord's Supper? Am I temporarily to suspend him until he has gone and become reconciled with this official?

I do not think that the action of your member is defensible on Christian grounds. Those words of Scripture that command us to love all men, to be at peace with all men, certainly condemn such an attitude as he is taking. The object of our ministry is to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." The attitude pictured in your letter is as far as possible removed from that which Christ showed towards His enemies. The man must be dealt with according to Matt. 18. In a case as indurated as this some time must be allowed for admonitions to take effect. But in the end the man must cease his enmity against the public official and must give evidence of this. Is all that we read in the Sermon on the Mount and in Rom. 12 on love towards our enemies to be set aside as non-essential in the Christian life as soon as we have a concrete case of an unchristian grudge as a result of an injustice, whether fancied or real?

15. TROUBLE OF A MEMBER WITH A FORMER PASTOR.

If one of my members sins against her former pastor, what is that former pastor to do? Tell her about it, or should he tell me about it? What is the practise of our Missouri Synod in such a matter? I hold that according to Matt. 18, 15—17 this former pastor would first have to tell it to the sinning party.

I assume that your member has sinned against her former pastor and that the latter has reported it to you and requests some kind of action. I would say that, if it was a private matter, it would be his duty to speak to the member first. Whether the stages of Matt. 18 can be applied under the circumstances—the former pastor is probably a thousand miles to the west or east—I do not know. What Jesus here prescribes is primarily for con-

gregational practise. I would say that, being at such a distance, if his private admonition does not result in any change, he should turn the case over to you. As for Scriptural proof, the law of love and the fact that we are brethren in Christ is sufficient.

16. A TROUBLESOME MEMBER.

One of the foremost members of my church is causing me a lot of trouble. His capacity in that direction is known also to my predecessors. Not a meeting but I dread that it will give him some occasion for a display of his ill will. My nerves begin to suffer.

I am very sorry that you are afflicted with the case which you describe in yours of November 5. These cases belong to the inscrutable ways of God. They help us become more careful in all that we say and do, more self-reliant, and more willing to let the Lord dispose of all things as He sees fit. Unfortunately, the good these people do they do not intend; and, thank God, they cannot very often do the evil which they intend. The main thing is that we do not lose sleep about such matters or let them "get on our nerves."

I have found a good preventive of sleepless nights when troubled by such persecution. I would as closely as possible estimate the situation which would arise at some stated meeting and then prepare in advance for the different possibilities an adequate reply or defense. In my younger years I would jot down a preparation of this kind in my note-book, assure myself that nothing was set down in malice or with undue sharpness, and then pigeonhole the matter until the day of the meeting. This would stop the brain from "racing" as it is likely to do when lying awake for an hour in excitement over some problem for which

I must find a solution or remedy. Nothing is more wearing on the system than this, and fortunate the man who has enough resources of prayer to quiet his soul and escape the horrors of insomnia.

17. A CASE FOR CHARITY.

In this locality we have a mutual telephone line. Any number of subscribers are on one line, called a division. In a certain division a quarrel broke out between several members (all these members are members of my church), and the quarrel naturally broke out again in a regular meeting of the Telephone Division. One member was taken to task for saying matters over the telephone which were forbidden by the constitution of the telephone company. He said, "If he could not say what he wanted over the telephone, he did not want a telephone." A fight ensued, and he was finally cut off by the division. He came to me. Knowing how complicated the whole affair was, I told him to bring his witnesses, and the other side were to bring their witnesses. Point for point was considered and settled to the satisfaction of both parties. Finally I asked if any more charges were to be brought up. None except one thing, said the man minus the phone. "All I want is my phone back." I told him that was a matter of the division to settle, not for pastor or congregation. It may be added that the men present were entirely in favor of restoring his phone rights, but said, "Let him settle those affairs with the division. We cannot settle them here, for this is not a meeting of the division." The man stayed away from church and was duly and properly admonished. The Telephone Division invited him seven times to appear and straighten out his affairs, but he refused. We had him before the congregation, and the congregation told him, "We have nothing to do with your telephone matters. We

are charging and reproving you for despising the means of grace and for harboring hatred." The man then promised to come back if the telephone would be given back to him. Here is the difficulty. Some members of the congregation are of the opinion that the division should simply connect him up again; I am of the same opinion, but added, "We can't compel them." They are entirely within their rights, they are bound to uphold their constitution, so that all things may be governed in an orderly manner. But to prove this assertion is another thing. Some say they cannot see that this man broke his contract by refusing to abide by the constitution. I believe that Luther, Vol. III, col. 467, §§ 245—253, would cover this case. The division is a worldly organization, a "state" or "nation," although small. Its rules must be upheld, or the division falls. Moreover, not all those constituting the division are members of the congregation. Even though our brethren would decide to drop the matter, the members outside of the congregation could rightly protest.

What you are confronted with is a typical case of *Dickkopf*, not a very extreme case, but bad enough to upset a whole congregation and spoil the minister's sleep. No pastoral-theology text has ever sufficiently treated this strange variety of Christian. For, indeed, I believe that these stubborn people are not really unrepentant, wicked sinners; they are simply so obstinate by heredity that they cannot adjust themselves. Arguments, pleas, threats, make no impression. The only way to save these people is to let them have their own will. You will never convince such a man that it is his duty to act in accord with his conscience. You will have to yield. Surely God does not want this soul to be lost on account of a squabble in the telephone company. I think of all that Christ has done for him, and later his parents, his pastors, — and then such a one is to

be damned because a telephone has been taken out? This cannot be God's will. So you may have to save this man in spite of himself and prevail upon the telephone company to put that instrument back. Then your man will confess all his wrongs and make amends.

I could give you other advice, which by perfect logic would consign this man to the devil. I cannot quote Walther or Luther for the suggestion I have given you. But I think we should remember that not all are wise that have been called, that love is the highest law, and that ecclesiastical procedure is intended to save souls, and finally, that no question of doctrine is involved.

18. TEACHER HAS PROPERTY IN ANOTHER CITY.

(Addressed to a Parochial-school Teacher.)

Your question is a difficult one to answer because your letter says so very little about the causes which underlie your contemplated resignation from office. Surely to be "somewhat dissatisfied with a teacher's life" is no reason for resigning the office. We all at times feel dissatisfied with the life of a servant of the Church; hence, if we were to act on this principle, there would soon be no teachers or ministers left. That you have a home of your own in another State is no reason why you should enter a secular calling. Even a business man at times will find it necessary to live in rented quarters possibly hundreds of miles distant from a cozy and well-appointed home since the nature of his work requires his absence from the city where he has established a home. This applies with twofold force to ministers and teachers, who, by the very nature of their calling, can never say: "This is my home; here I will stay regardless of what calls I might receive to other fields of labor." But if the fact that he has a home of his own

must not prevent a servant of the Church from accepting a call to another city, much less should he resign his office in order to return to the roof which he calls his property.

Whether you may under certain circumstances resign your office and return to your former home depends entirely upon the nature of these circumstances. I would not say offhand that those who give up the office of a teacher in every case commit "a very grave sin" or that they can no longer remain "faithful Christians." Beyond what I have written above I can give you no advice because the circumstances would have to be very carefully weighed, and concerning these circumstances your letter conveys no information. Offhand I should say that under present conditions, when the shortage of teachers has grown to be so serious, the parochial-school teacher should consider very carefully whether the distress of the Church does not require of him a spirit of sacrifice in a higher sense even than in former years and that a refusal to bring such sacrifice must be regarded in a most serious light indeed. On the other hand, the conditions of our day surely justify our teachers in making any reasonable and evangelical effort in the direction of persuading their congregations, and even demanding of them, to pay them a salary sufficient to maintain themselves and their families on an American standard of living, if the congregations are financially able to do this.

19. PROSELYTIZING.

All those texts which stress the divinity of the ministerial call may be quoted also against proselytizing. Proselytizing I would define as stealing away sheep from called shepherds of congregations outside of our communion. Where we recognize the Christian character of a church, we recognize the ministry and do not solicit members from their flocks. On the other hand, when the

denomination is not Christian, we recognize no such restriction. The modernistic bodies become quite a problem in this respect. It seems as if we must make a distinction between the body as a whole and the individual congregation. For instance, the Third Baptist Church in St. Louis is evangelical; the Second Baptist Church is modernistic, frankly so. Shall I treat the members of a declared infidel as if he were a called shepherd of Christ? If I take sheep away from a wolf, is that proselytizing? I submit these questions for your deliberation in order to draw a clear line between legitimate missionary work and proselytizing. Thirty years ago we were still right in assuming that the average Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian clergyman stood on the confessions of his Church or at least on the fundamentals of Christianity. To-day we have no such assurance concerning any of these denominations.

20. JOINT ADVERTISING.

We advertise our church services in the secular papers, and when the readers come to our church, whether Protestant, Jews, Catholics, or unbelievers, we do not consider it wrong. Rather, it is the natural and desired result of our advertising. Now, suppose our Missouri Synod churches decided to have a noonday Lenten service at a down-town auditorium, in this case that of an Episcopal church; suppose further that we give these services due publicity by newspaper advertising and special handbills or programs, — now, just what would be wrong (and if at all, then why?) 1) in extending an invitation to the church whose auditorium we are using for their members to attend this service, and 2) in giving the printed programs to Ohio Synod pastors for distribution in their church, which would automatically carry an invitation to attend these services along with it?

In the matter of inviting others to our services the crucial point is that we must do nothing that would create the impression as though we refused to recognize the validity of the ministry in other Christian denominations. Any form of invitation which would treat their flock as missionary material would be wrong in principle. For this reason I dislike all invitations issued to the general public. If the Ohio Synod pastors in the case which you refer to distribute such invitations themselves, the point above referred to cannot be urged. To arrange with them for distribution of our handbills would be proper only after relations of fellowship have been established.

21. CONGREGATION OF ANOTHER LUTHERAN BODY APPLIES FOR SERVICES.

A congregation of the — Synod has requested you to consider the possibility of an amalgamation because it is unable to get a resident pastor. It is taken for granted that representatives of that church approach you in the matter. If they call on you, give them an occasion to state what the conditions are under which they would unite with your congregation. Of course, such negotiations must be entered upon only if these people, without any suggestion from you, voluntarily approach you with a request for a discussion of conditions under which you would receive them into membership. If they have no reasons for questioning the soundness of your Lutheranism, *i. e.*, if they do not bring the old charge of "Calvinism," etc., the common-sense procedure would be for them to convince themselves by hearing your sermons whether they agree with you in doctrine and then to make their decision according to what they have learned from your preaching and practise concerning Missouri Lutheranism.

22. AN INVITATION FROM THE MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE.

The Ministerial Alliance of our city is requesting twelve pastors of different denominations to present the distinctive doctrines of their particular denomination in a series of mid-week services conducted in the local Methodist church. A devotional period, singing, Scripture-lesson, and prayer, would open these services, and then would follow the presentation of doctrine by a pastor.

I have been requested to present our doctrines. In answer to this proposition I said that I should be violating one of our principles if, in order to present our teachings, I were to do this in a service of this nature. Then the offer was at once made to turn the entire service of that evening over to me and to permit me to conduct a strictly Lutheran service, including our liturgy. My congregation would in that case be present.

Now, would I be guilty of practise which is not consistent with our Lutheran principles by accepting this offer? If so, how, in your opinion, would that service have to be arranged in order that I might avail myself of the opportunity to confess our doctrines?

I can see no reason for refusing that service in the series arranged by the Ministerial Alliance; in fact, I can see more than one good reason why you should make use of this opportunity to speak to the people about Lutheran fundamentals. It will give you a reason also to explain why our church-body is neither modernist nor fundamentalist, since it accepts the Bible alone and believes that agreement in all its teachings, not only in the fundamentals, is necessary for church-fellowship. It will give you a chance to testify to the clearness of Holy Scripture, the deity of Christ, the atonement, and justification by faith.

Your condition must be that you also read the prayers,

Scriptures, etc. I find that one has no trouble if one declares that "this is the rule of our Church."

I would not insist on the Lutheran liturgy, but leave that to the church in which you are receiving this courtesy. If they have conceded the point, you may do so, but it is not an essential of confession.

If anything should happen during the service that would look to you like a violation of the agreement, do not interrupt the service or refuse to go on, but carry it through and in a letter to the Ministerial Alliance make your complaint of such violation, stating again our doctrine of church-fellowship. That would certainly be better than giving public offense by an insistence on details which the audience will not comprehend. The Lord wants you to preach the Gospel to every creature, and I believe that even when conditions are not absolutely ideal from our Lutheran standpoint, we should speak out and give the Gospel a chance; and let us not be apologetic about it or introduce our remarks with labored explanations about our principle of church-fellowship. You cannot make that plain in a few sentences, and the people are there to hear the Lutheran doctrine of salvation. Give it to them straight.

The following from *Lehre und Wehre*, August, 1868, 253 f., from the pen of Dr. Walther, is to the point: "It goes without saying that an orthodox teacher may very well, upon proper invitation, preach the Word of God in its purity to the congregation of a heterodox teacher without offending against the Word of God and without degrading his office as a servant of the Church of the pure Gospel. If Jesus has an absolute right to rule even among His enemies, why, then, should not His servant in God's name bear strong and courageous witness for the truth as it lives in his heart, provided, of course, he does not thereby

violate another man's ministry and provided he clearly sets forth his definite stand as an enemy of false doctrine and unionism? Conditions may arise when it is even his sacred duty to make use of a proper and unsought opportunity for announcing the full counsel of God in the midst of a flock of Jesus Christ which has permitted itself out of ignorance to become involved with a heretical church-body. According to the measure of his gifts he will then, by positive exhibition of the true doctrine, lead them to recognize their unscriptural standing. But it by no means follows that an orthodox teacher who bears testimony in the manner described will concede to the false teacher a right to address his own orthodox flock or even invite him so to address the latter."

23. SELLING CHRISTMAS SEALS TO OUTSIDERS.

It has been my custom every year to have my school-children sell the Wheat Ridge Christmas Seals. In order to do the work more thoroughly this year, I had our whole town divided into districts and then had certain teams canvass each district. So it happened that the pupils also offered these seals to people who do not belong to our congregation. The question now arises, Was this proper? Was it against Scripture or against the practise of our Synod?

While it is not good practise to solicit gifts for charitable purposes from outsiders, I do not think that an issue should be made of such a transgression of our rule as you describe. Everybody around Christmas-time uses some kind of seal, and I hardly think that offense is taken if now and then an outsider is asked to use one of our booklets. But I would discourage the practise and point out that, no matter how small the amount solicited, the practise of ob-

taining funds for our charity work from those not affiliated with our Church is reprehensible. Charitable undertakings which compel us to appeal to outsiders are not a Christian duty.

24. COMMUNITY FUND.

Should our people contribute to community funds from which support is given to sectarian and Catholic institutions?

In St. Louis the promoters of the Community Fund have made the arrangement that one may subscribe either to the fund or indicate one's preference for any one of the purposes included in the collection. I can indicate on my pledge card "Provident Association" or "Open-air Camp," and then my donation will go to that particular purpose. If your Community Fund does not make this provision, I would suggest that our Lutheran donors simply write on the card "For Provident Association" or whatever charity you have which is not a sectarian undertaking.

25. A SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

A Soldiers' Memorial Service has been arranged to which all the churches and all the clergy of the city are invited. This puts me and our little mission into a predicament. To join in a union service in one of the local churches is contrary to our principles. On the other hand, to remain away from the memorial service would throw a bad light on us and during this time of war would cause others to doubt my people's patriotism. Now, in case this service should be conducted in the city park, would it be acting contrary to Lutheran principles if I accepted the invitation to preach in case I had the order of the service all to myself?

When such things as a public memorial service are brewing, it is best for us to go right to the head of the

procession and lead them on. We are at a disadvantage if we make our declaration of principles only as a last resort. It is best to wait on the authorities as soon as such public demonstrations are proposed, offer our help as citizens, and keep it on the civic plane throughout. If the thing must be religious after all, a statement of principles would be in order. If you have shown the proper interest in the first place, you will have little trouble in taking over the entire service. I see no reason why in that event you should not conduct this memorial program in the city park.

26. COMMUNITY CHRISTMAS.

Is it unionistic practise for one of our Lutheran churches to take part in a community Christmas-tree program together with the other churches of that city? One pastor informs me that only the old-time Christmas chorals, such as "Silent Night," are to be sung at the occasion. He adds that no prayer is to be spoken, with the exception of the Lord's Prayer if requested. The press announcement reads: "All the churches of the town, Lutheran, Catholic Methodist, Christian, Baptist, and Presbyterian, are participating."

Participation in any community Christmas service should be avoided by our pastors and congregations. Either the festival is stripped of religious significance, and then the celebration is surely an abomination to our Lord, — it is the kind in which Herod and the Jewish elders could have joined, — or it is a religious celebration, with hymns, prayers, etc., and participation then is certainly unionistic. The offense which is given consists in a false appearance of spiritual union. Unless we accept the principle that joint prayer and worship are conditioned upon unity of religious belief, we have no longer a compass to steer by. We have then lost every claim upon our membership except

that of "loyalty" or tradition, — a very poor claim, as the Lutheran Church found out in 1820, when it was about dead. The thing must work utter confusion in the minds of the common people whose minds are logical enough to ask the question, If on Christmas night, then why not on Christmas Day or any Sunday?

27. REFORM MOVEMENTS AND SOCIAL RIGHTEOUSNESS.

When the city mayor appoints you as member of an advisory committee which is to assist the police officers and courts in the improvement of moral conditions, accept. And if you accept, do not make provisos and conditions. Endeavors to put a religious face upon the movement you can meet as they arise. Do not doubt that in such a case your testimony against religious unionism and against mixing Church and State will be heeded. Some years ago when the cabaret shows of St. Louis were "running wild," and the men from Jefferson Barracks were placed in moral peril, I was a member of a committee of ten appointed by the police commissioners to obtain the necessary evidence. Some day I mean to tell you how, as a result, I was sued for \$50,000 actual and punitive damages by Belvidere Joe. What is to the point, I found no difficulty then — or later in the Civic Union of St. Louis — to maintain an absolutely neutral position in religious questions. It was possible to maintain these activities entirely on the civic plane.

On the other hand, I would as carefully observe the line which is to be drawn between my ministerial work and such activities in behalf of civic righteousness. Also the element of time must be considered. Your work is the cure of souls, and if participation in social work should make inroads upon the time which you must devote to your ministerial duties, no one in your congregation or outside

of it should blame you for standing aloof from these movements.

This is not the same as saying that our preaching should be directed against sin only in the abstract. It is the duty of the Christian preacher to lift up his voice against the vices and follies of the day, against the drink evil, the betting evil, impure theatrical shows, the modern dance, to castigate the hypocrisy of much that passes for charity, the anarchistic tendencies among the poor, the pride of the rich, their tax-dodging, their fattening on the toil of children, etc. But what is the most wonderful, the only effective weapon, the only means that can work a radical change in modern life? Is it not that very Gospel which he is commissioned to preach? The apostles of Christ could have found occasion to launch movements for the social betterment of the Roman world. The question of capital and labor was as burning then as now; there were the slums in Rome and Alexandria, offering a wealth of material for the student of social corruption and for a wide field for reform; there was slave-labor and the slave-trade; there were public festivals that defied decency; inhuman methods of punishing crime; a tyrannical form of government, — and yet the apostles never made it their business to lead a popular crusade against these evils, to agitate changes in existing laws, or to regulate the public administration of justice. Their work was limited to bringing souls to Christ and to instructing their converts in the will of God that they might lead godly lives. But what was the result of this evangelistic activity? It worked the result which no other means could have ever achieved — in a few centuries the more aggravated ills of heathen society had largely ceased to exist. Where the Gospel obtained a foothold, the licentious and barbarous heathen temple-worship fell into disuse, the theaters were closed, the

slaughter of innocent prisoners ceased to be a public spectacle, the oppression of the poor remained but a horrid memory.

Yet this is no reason why you as citizen should not upon invitation take part in movements for social betterment. If we can bring the light of Christian experience, the power of the Christian conscience, to bear upon the problems of citizenship, no one must charge us with mixing Church and State or with engaging in activities inconsistent with the pastoral office. Though our Church comes first, we also love our country, and we cannot give evidence of that love in a better way than by raising our nation's standards of conduct, whether public or private.

28. LABOR SUNDAY.

I see no reason why you should observe the first Sunday in September in accordance with the letter addressed to the clergy of your city by the Central Labor Union. Looking over this invitation, which suggests as a theme for this Sunday's sermon "Causes for Industrial Warfare," I observe that the pastors are advised to read nine books, involving an expenditure of twelve dollars, in preparation for their discourse. They are to inform themselves regarding the "economic aspects" of the situation in the world of labor and capital and thus to contribute their share to the task of "bringing all groups of men closer together and interpreting each to the other." Instead, I would go my accustomed way and preach on the Gospel- or Epistle-lesson of the Sunday.

This is not saying that the first Sunday in September may not be occasionally treated as a special Sunday and that your sermon may not be based on a text bearing on the economic problem, especially in its phase of capital and labor. What we should bear in mind when discussing this

subject from the pulpit is that the industrial problems have a satisfactory solution only in the Word of God. True, the Bible does not specifically answer the question how many cubic feet of breathing space there ought to be in a laboring man's work-room or whether wages should be paid on an eight-hour basis. Yet the Word of God supplies a full and adequate solution of all industrial problems nevertheless. If I must treat one Sunday a year as Labor Sunday, I would first of all emphasize that by His means of grace the Holy Spirit makes new men. The Word of God fundamentally changes the character and nature of workingman and capitalist. It makes children of God of both rich and poor. And by making Christians of employer and employee, it effectually solves every problem that affects their relation to one another. The Bible not only teaches every man his duty and marks out for him a God-pleasing line of conduct, but, what is much more, the Holy Spirit, through the Word, so renews the nature and will of men that they now gladly serve God and their fellow-man in righteousness and love. There can be neither strikes nor lockouts where hearts are all renewed by the divine Spirit. I would then point out that from our Lutheran pulpits the Gospel is preached, not once a year, but every Sunday and holiday. Our Lutheran congregations are to a very great percentage, possibly ninety per cent., made up of workingmen. And they are not the kind of workingmen that become enemies of government and law when there is an industrial dispute. Yet they represent, for all their lack of riotous proclivity, the most progressive and efficient type, and probably the highest paid, among American workingmen to-day. — Reference to capital is next in place. There are also wealthy men in the Lutheran Church, employers of great hosts of laborers. But they are not the kind that will grind the faces of the poor or

withhold from the laborer his hire. The spirit of Christ permits neither the workingman to seek his own advantage at the cost of righteousness, nor does it permit the rich man to amass greater wealth at the cost of human life, health, and happiness.

Only by preaching the Gospel of Christ, which makes all men truly equal and binds the hearts of rich and poor together in love, can the industrial problem be solved. A simple Gospel sermon such as you preach every Sunday does more to maintain industrial peace than some labored effort of a preacher discoursing upon "Fatigue and Efficiency" or "Shall Wage Questions be Settled by Federal Arbitration?" There is nothing quite so pitiable as an amateur philosopher in the pulpit wading out beyond his depth.

29. THE LODGE AND CHRISTIANITY.

A summing up of our argument against the lodge is what you want, and while I understand your question, I do not approve altogether of the wording of it. You state it too negatively. Our argument is as much interested in winning the lodge man as it is in proving to the lodge-members that they cannot remain in fellowship with us. Furthermore it is my conviction that we are to-day gaining more from the lodges than we are losing to them. It is now a common experience for our ministers to accept members who have left the secret orders. It is more rarely the case that we must excommunicate on account of lodge-membership. A large percentage of the 8,000 adults whom we annually confirm and baptize are former lodge-members. And that argument which in most cases was crowned with success is the demonstration that being a lodge man and being a Christian involves an inconsistency. My argument is not that all lodge-members are unbelievers. In my own observation I have known the opposite to be true. There

are Christians in the lodge, also in the Masonic Order. But these people are not aware of the sinfulness of the lodge. They are not conscious, at least not inwardly convinced, of the wrong of lodge connection. And before we exclude members from our communion because they belong to the lodge, we must first endeavor to instruct them, no matter how firmly we may be convinced that they went in with open eyes. An effort must be made to bring them to a realization of the sinfulness of their worshiping jointly with men who reject Jesus Christ, despising the means of grace; to bring them to see that the lodge, which pronounces all those blessed who die as "good lodge men," teaches a way of salvation which leads to hell, since no man has ever been saved by good character.

Wherever the congregation has convinced itself that in the case of the particular lodge under consideration such is indeed the doctrine and practise of the order and that membership in it is an inconsistency for a Christian, is a sin and a denial of Christ, it will know what course to take with one who stubbornly maintains his right to stand on a platform which tries to unite what cannot be united — the worship of the lodge idol and the worship of the true God, salvation by grace alone and salvation by conduct. No one who endeavors to unite in his own practise and belief the religion of the flesh with the religion of Jesus Christ has that knowledge of salvation which is the first essential of admission to church-membership. In saying this, we do not at all require of those with whom we are dealing an especial degree of Christian knowledge. The very fundamentals of Christianity are involved. If Christianity demands of its adherents that they worship the true God alone and that they profess no religion which denies, by direct implication, that Jesus is the only Savior and that man cannot save himself by good conduct, then it must

demand that those who regard themselves as followers of Jesus Christ separate themselves from those who hold contrary religious views. The simple fact that in the lodge men of all religions worship together is sufficient to establish its non-Christian character.

I do not agree with the argument which charges every lodge with being "idolatrous." That accusation holds good regarding the Masons, Odd-Fellows, Knights of Pythias, Eastern Star, and a number of others. These are plainly deistic, involving the worship of a Supreme Being which is not the God of the Bible, but "the God who reveals Himself to all men in nature." Explicitly the name of Christ is excluded from all prayers and from the Scripture quoted. With this is joined the notion that natural man can acknowledge God as his Father. In these lodges a figment of the human brain called Great Spirit or Architect of the Universe is worshiped. But in most lodges there is not what one can designate as idolatrous worship, but a unionistic or syncretistic worship of God. God is worshiped, but not in a manner in which He desires. In fact, these people worship Him in a manner which He has distinctly forbidden when He told us to worship Him in spirit and in truth. In dealing with members of such orders, we draw their attention to the fact that they are praying jointly with those who belong to no church, have no knowledge of the Gospel, do not repent over sin, and do not use the means of grace,—with these and with Jews and outspoken agnostics. Such worship is an insult to God, and Christians can have no part in it. With this line of argument you can reach the conscience of Christians enmeshed in these minor lodges and prove to them the inconsistency of their conduct. To participate in religious ceremonies with those who either do not worship the true God at all or worship Him in a manner He has forbidden and to expect

salvation as the reward of a virtuous life, these things do not agree with elementary Christianity. There are Christians in the lodge who have never become aware of this inconsistency. But when it is pointed out to them, it does not take long to convince them. The last step is often not so quickly reached. Personal factors enter in with which it is sometimes difficult to deal. But this does not mean that it is hard to convince a person of the wrongfulness of the lodge religion. The results which our pastors have achieved bears out this contention. I have known a student of the middle class doing supply-work in Colorado obtain the release of eleven men from the Order of Elks.

30. THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE LODGE PRAYERS.

Continually I meet with the objection: "But the Lord's Prayer itself does not use the name of Christ!" when I refer to the Christless religion of the lodge, particularly to the omission of the name of our Lord from the prayers. What is a man to answer? As a matter of fact the name of Jesus does not appear in the Lord's Prayer.

To begin with, the attitude of our Church is not by any means that every prayer must conclude with some such phrase as, "We ask it for Jesus' sake." Praying in the name of Christ does not mean mentioning His name in prayer, but to put our trust and confidence for an answer in that work of redemption which He who bears this name has accomplished. Hence, even if the name of Jesus is used, that by no means in itself proves that the prayer is a Christian one. In the case of the lodge this becomes a very important consideration, since the lodge, especially Freemasonry, teaches with all possible emphasis that we are saved by our works, by a life "by the level and on the square." Christ is excluded from the way of salvation,

hence any reference to Him in a Masonic prayer simply makes it a blasphemous misuse of His name.

When we pray the Lord's Prayer, we say: "Our Father who art in heaven." Our Father — whose Father? Certainly not the Father of those who believe that they can enter heaven "by the pass of a blameless life." The very word "Father" implies faith in Jesus as the Son of God and Redeemer of the world, Matt. 11, 27. Every Christian who utters that prayer utters it "in the name of Jesus Christ," relying solely upon His merits, who by His Gospel has brought him into communion with the Father, through the adoption of sons.

It follows that only Christians can pray the Lord's Prayer as it was understood in the mind of Christ, who taught it only to His disciples, even as He addressed only His followers when He told them to pray "in His name."

The charge against lodge-worship is not that it omits reference to Christ, but that it omits such reference by design. Masonry includes Jews, Parsees, and Mohammedans; hence, to avoid the offense which the name of Jesus would give, He is excluded from the basic ritual. This is a denial of Jesus Christ and will, by His own testimony, result in His disowning those on Judgment Day who have so denied Him. Hence the Christless worship of the lodge is a damnable sin, and those guilty of it have no place in the Christian congregation.

Lodge prayer is sinful, whether the name of Christ is mentioned or not. It is sinful when the name of Christ is omitted because it is omitted in order to maintain the lodge principle; no repentance and no faith in Christ is required in the lodge way of salvation, hence He is barred from the ritual. On the other hand, lodge prayer would be sinful also if or wherever Christ's name is mentioned, since such use of His name would be blasphemy. Of such praying Christ speaks Matt. 7, 21.

31. CAMPBELLITE BAPTISM.

Regarding your question, "Is the baptism of the Christian (Campbellite) Church a valid baptism?" I wish to say that the validity of a Campbellite baptism is in doubt because of the uncertain attitude of Campbellism towards the doctrine of the Trinity. It will be necessary in each case to inquire into the confession of the particular congregation of which the baptizing clergyman is minister. This is not so simple a matter, the publicly expressed views of the minister, the church books, and the Sunday-school literature being probably the best criterion. Where uncertainty remains, the baptism should not be treated as valid.

32. EPISCOPALIANS.

The groups which you refer to in the Episcopal Church — High, Low, and Broad — are no divisions or separate organizations, but are *Richtungen*, or tendencies, in the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country and in the Church of England. The High Church stands for those congregations which are strongly leaning towards Romanism. In these we have priests under something like a celibacy vow, there are orders of monks and nuns, masses are celebrated, the elements are reserved, there are prayers for the dead, holy water, blessed candles, relics, in fact, most of the Catholic theology except only the Pope.

The Broad Church is the modernistic wing, which in our country as well as in England has the upper hand.

There is a diminishing number of those who cling to the doctrine of the Anglican confessions; these are the evangelical party, also called Low Church.

It is a pity to note that the modernistic group seems to have control of religious education in the Episcopal Church. The Sunday-school literature is badly infected with the "social gospel," and the attitude generally appears to be expressed in this reply of a local director of religious

education when he was asked how children were expected to take the miracles of the Old Testament: "Creative teaching is not concerned with whether these stories are myths, miracles, or allegories, but aims to appeal to the child on the level of his own experience."

The organ of the Broad Church in this country is the *Churchman*, published in Milwaukee, and that of the High Church is the *Living Church*, published in New York.

In England some one, years ago, a bit irreverently described the difference between the three factions in the ditty: "Low and lazy, broad and hazy, high and crazy."

33. SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISM CHRISTIAN?

Would like to ask you why, in your book "Prophecy and the War," page 17, you refer to the Seventh-day Adventists as an "unchristian cult." What I have gathered from conversations with a Seventh-day Adventist missionary and from Mrs. White's book "The Great Controversy" is this: The Seventh-day Adventists, followers of Mrs. Ellen White, are Trinitarians; they believe that "we receive forgiveness of sins and are justified before God, not by our works, but by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith"; that Jesus Christ is the Son of Man and the Son of God, "God manifest in the flesh"; that the Bible is the inspired Word of God; and "that the Spirit was not given — nor can it ever be bestowed — to supersede the Bible." This, I am sure, is sufficient to give them a place within the pale of Christianity. If I were to attempt to express my opinion of Adventists, 'a la White' or otherwise, this poor, second-hand Oliver typewriter would not stand the strain. No, I believe that here, too, I ought to "do good to them that hate me" and "despitefully use me" and pester my members. If we label Adventists as an "unchristian cult," which, I truly believe, is an injustice, we label ourselves "uncharitable" or worse, and I know we have enough of

such labels sticking on us undeservedly without earning a few more.

The Seventh-day Adventists have views concerning the Trinity which are consistently worded so as not to read like an acceptance of the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed. Cf., for instance, the quotation in Guenther's *Symbolik*, p. 106. I am acquainted with such declarations as that of the Foreston Convention many years ago, and I know that some of the propaganda material contains professions of faith in the Trinity; but the bulk of the denomination is anti-Trinitarian. The Seventh-day Adventists are among the most shameless of all proselytizers, being surpassed in this respect only by the Campbellites. They are out-and-out fanatics on the Sabbath question and on the cleansing of the sanctuary. I have seen some of our members completely crazed by their sermons and pamphlets. They stress the Trinity and the atonement when first approaching the members of some Christian Church. When they have gained the confidence of the unsuspecting Christians in this way, they begin to work up the Sabbath and the cleansing of the sanctuary and soon enmesh any one who is not very sure-footed through their skilful misuse of the Scriptures. I still have some measure of sympathy with the faithful old Christian preachers in the Reformed denominations; but with the fanatical cults who depend for growth entirely on apostates from Protestantism I have little patience. Their activity is wholly predatory.

Lately a canvasser for this denomination went about among the members of a Lutheran church at Mount Healthy, Ohio, selling "Antibilious Worm Tablets," manufactured by the "German Remedy Company." While selling this nostrum, he would engage the women in conversation and deftly lead over from the worms to — Adventism.

34. PURITANS AND PILGRIMS.

You ask my opinion of an article which quotes with approval such judgments as these: "They [the Pilgrims] illustrated for the first time in history the principles of civil and religious liberty and the practise of a genuine democracy." "At almost any time between 1628 and 1776 the Puritans could have framed the Declaration of Independence."

While this is a traditional view regarding the Pilgrim Fathers and Puritans, it is wide of the truth, and we should work to the end that in our parochial schools the history of the United States is presented correctly in this respect. It is true that the distinction between Separatists and Puritans must be observed. However, the principle of separatism, as has frequently been pointed out, became academic in settlements separated by three thousand miles from the Anglican Church; but what is much more essential, the research especially of Dr. Williston Walker of Hartford Theological Seminary has conclusively demonstrated that the Puritan settlements of Salem and throughout Massachusetts and Connecticut within the very first period of their existence adopted the Congregational (Independent) system of the Pilgrims. Dr. Walker says: "The Puritan churches organized in New England adopted the principles of Separatist Plymouth in their formation and government," and he devotes many pages to the delineation of the steps which led to this conversion of (Presbyterian) Puritanism in the colonies to Congregationalism. So completely was this change accomplished that as late as 1836 there were but two Presbyterian churches in all Massachusetts. The point of this is that the entire distinction between Separatism and Puritanism does not hold with reference to American colonial history, and it cannot be maintained that the Puritan attitude of

intolerance and illiberality offers a contrast to Plymouth Separatism. It is precisely the Plymouth system that became operative throughout the New England settlements.

As for the Pilgrims, Dr. Walker, himself a Congregationalist, says in his *The Congregationalists* (New York, 1894), page 98: "Neither Pilgrims nor Puritans had any thought of establishing liberty for men to do as they please; nor would any general toleration, such as we justly value, have furnished motives definite enough to have led our ancestors to the New World." Congregationalism, in the colonies, became "essentially a state church" (p. 114). Undoubtedly the Pilgrim influence was paramount in the colonies, and undoubtedly its influence was cast wholly on the side of a Puritan establishment, the functions of government being interlocked with the functions of the Church, with the result that Baptists, Quakers, Presbyterians, Anglicans, and Catholics were alike oppressed and sometimes persecuted. There is in all the literature which has come down to us from early colonial times not a trace of the principle of civil and religious liberty as we understand these to-day.

I take exception also to certain statements in detail contained in the article in question. It is not correct to say that the Separatists wanted to reform the Anglican Church from without. Douglas Campbell, in his monumental work *The Puritan in Holland, England, and America* (Harper's, 1893), conclusively shows that the Separatists regarded the entire Anglican system as incorrigible and unreformable. The article says: "The one party, weak and friendless, fled to Holland and thence to America." Shall posterity so reward the liberality of the Netherlands Republic, which gave asylum to the harried Non-conformists, who there, according to Morton, secretary to the Plymouth Colony, "did sweetly enjoy their

liberties"? Throughout the article there is no reference to the fact, absolutely established by Mr. Campbell, that the Dutch Republic is the true mother of modern civic and religious liberty and that whatever in the way of democratic institutions the Plymouth settlers possessed — the secret written ballot and the township system — was a gift of the Netherlands. This is a most deplorable omission. The entire story of the exodus from Holland, 1620, as told in this article, is very unsatisfactory. The old traditional view is again given currency that the Pilgrims "turned to a company of London merchants for aid," when as a matter of fact the first advances were made by the London speculators and not by the congregation at Leyden. Nor do I find any reference to the incessant quarreling of the Pilgrims in their Dutch asylum and their intense disapproval of the Dutch conception of the Sabbath, differing essentially from the Old Testament view of the Pilgrims, two very important factors, as pointed out as early as 1845 by Thomas W. Coit (*Puritanism*, Appleton & Co.), in the considerations which led to the settlement of Plymouth.

Finally I deplore the absence of any reference in this article to the debts which America owes to the Baptists, who were the first to dissent from the illiberal attitude of Puritanism in matters of religion and who were the first to announce on American soil the principle of separation of Church and State. No discussion of Puritanism, be it ever so elementary, can afford to ignore this great fact.

All honor to the early settlers of New England for their courage and moral earnestness and for such contributions as they, on Dutch precedents, have embodied in American civil life. But no purpose that I can appreciate is served by ignoring the patent facts which point to a system of "discipline" which widely differs from the ideals which now govern American institutions.

II. IN THE FIELD OF DOCTRINE.

1. THE INTOLERANCE OF THE GOSPEL.

When they call you "strict, strait-laced, legalistic," and when they charge you with being "nursed on orthodoxy" which stands for "separatism and aloofness," it is fitting, of course, that you proceed with a rigorous self-examination whether to any extent, be it large or small, you are giving reason and cause for these accusations. Even if defensible on doctrinal grounds, your attitude towards non-Missourians may be such as to give the impression of pharisaic aloofness. How to avoid such an impression is, of course, another question, since it is the common charge leveled against all who are practising according to strict Lutheran principles. Still our manner should not be repulsive, high-hatted, or self-righteous even in appearance towards others who bear the Lutheran name — or towards any Protestant, Catholic, Jew, agnostic, for that matter.

It was Dr. William M. Taylor who, fifty years ago, said in his series of addresses called *Paul the Missionary* that intolerance is in a certain sense necessary in the interests of religious freedom. He explains this thought as follows: "Paul's letters to the Galatians and to the Romans were written for the preservation of liberty; for in one of them he says: 'Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free'; and yet, for the very purpose of maintaining that liberty, he hurled his anathemas at the Judaizers' heads. Let us not forget that the Gospel has its intolerance as well as its toleration. There must be no toleration of treason to the Cross; for the toleration of such treason is always treachery. I say not indeed that all such errors should be put down by force, — God forbid! —

but I do say that they should be denounced by every loyal servant of the Lord and that the Church should absolve itself from all complicity with the errorists. And though there are many who would cry out against such a course as bigoted, I would rather, even in the interests of freedom itself, have — if you choose to call it so — the bigotry of Paul than the indifference of him who counts nothing essential and who is everything by turns and nothing long." Next I was surprised to read this reference to Martin Luther: "Luther was no foe of freedom, but indeed its greatest modern pioneer; and in the proportion in which, like him, we are intolerant of everything that compromises the honor of Christ or the doctrine of His Cross, we shall conserve and widen the liberty which he did so much to secure. So let us raise anew the shout of Paul, making it our motto, not for the moment of our brief enthusiasm merely, but for all our lives: 'God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world.'"

I can only add that in the same degree as we remain humble, we shall be preserved in this truly Christlike intolerance. When we begin to glorify the Lutheran Church as an organization instead of glorifying Christ by taking upon ourselves the reproach of the Gospel, we have become fit material for the unionistic church politician to work upon.

2. WILL STRICTNESS KILL OUR CHURCH?

That the Church will never succeed unless it gives up its narrowness and becomes more liberal is the assertion made by one out of five of the unchurched. Of course, I have no intention of modifying our doctrine to suit these so-called "prospects." But what shall one reply to those who tell us that our strictness is not in harmony with the age and country we are living in?

Let me take for granted that our Church on account of its strictness is not suited for this present age. In that case it would behoove us to remember that it is not our business at all to save the Church or to build the Church. That is the Lord's business. Preachers and people have only one business — to be witnesses for Jesus Christ. One thing is required of them, that they love their Lord and Master and be obedient to His will. Then, by their testimony to His teachings, God wants to build and preserve the Church. It is not their business at all to consider whether these teachings are popular or whether those who hold them will be regarded as bigots, fanatics, as narrow and pharisaical. They are to trust the good Lord that He has made no mistake in commissioning them to preach exactly what He taught His evangelists and apostles, the divinely ordained teachers until the Day of Judgment, to set forth in the Scriptures. If we are going to listen to this fleshly complaining about "strictness" and "narrowness," where do you suppose this thing will end? Do you know that the world generally believes that there is no difference at all between the teachings of the Pope and those of the Church of the Reformation? They call even these differences which touch nearly every single doctrine that Jesus taught "hair-splitting."

Some will not go to that length. Of course, they say Romanism will never do; we must teach the Gospel. But why be so narrow in our judgments of what is right and wrong? This, of course, is the main point of your opposition. Instead of arguing with them, why not draw their attention to this significant fact: Which are the powerful, independent, growing church-bodies? Those which hew to the line of those doctrines and principles which they hold to be true. Why in other quarters this tendency toward union? Is it not a sign of weakness and helpless-

ness? They see the people slipping away from them and hope to save the situation through strong organization. Look about you and tell me, which churchbuildings are standing empty and disused in your city and county? Which have the dwindling audiences? Is it not those of the liberal type?

Then I would continue: Have you ever seen an abandoned Lutheran church? How many of our congregations can you mention that are going backward even financially? What does it mean that many are hardly able, many quite unable, to accommodate the worshipers on Sunday morning? Some Reformed churches, very few, draw crowds through the reputation of the preacher as a pulpit orator. But the majority even of the Reformed churches that are well attended are churches of the conservative, the "strict" type. Men want something definite in religion. The consistent, fearless Church is the strong Church. Recently the *Expositor* received a letter from a preacher in Minneapolis in which the writer explains the means employed by him to "draw the crowds." "Not movie shows or any other kind of worldliness," but "the preaching of the old-time Gospel of Jesus." He has had an increase in membership from 700 to 1,200 in seven years. "But we got rid of about 350 dead ones the first year I was here. God helped us to get rid of them without any disturbance or ill will." Whether evangelical means were employed in cleansing this church of worldly-minded members, the record does not say. But strictness did not kill that church. It now supports five of its own missionaries and ten native workers in various heathen lands. No suppers or auctions or tricks to raise the money; the people just plainly give. Common working-people constitute the congregation. Three thousand people attend services every Sunday.

Strictness does not hurt the Church. With us strictness means that we take God at His word, that we accept His commission as it reads, and that we are not swerved by the cry for a "liberal" gospel from our endeavors to preach the will of God as we know it.

3. THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE.

I thank you very much for the letter of Dr. Henry, herewith returned. The Doctor overlooks the fact that science and theology differ in their criteria of truth. Science works by induction, on the basis of observation and experiment. Theology, if of the right kind, has its criterion of truth in revelation. With those who deny revelation we can dispute as little as a scientist would care to dispute with one who ignores the results of a valid induction.

4. STUMBLING-BLOCKS TO FAITH.

We lately discussed the bearing of evolution on Christian faith, but it occurs to me that I should have been a little more explicit. What would be the effect on faith if biologists or geologists produced some kind of evidence that would appear altogether conclusive in favor of evolution? I think we are agreed that evolution and the doctrines of historic Christianity cannot be harmonized. But I pointed out that the acceptance of evolution would create an even greater problem—how to account on mechanistic (materialistic) grounds for the influence of Christianity on human life during the days of the Roman Empire and wherever its message has been preached during the ages that followed. But there is something else that I had in mind and should have said in this connection. My study of this problem goes back some thirty years, to a time when mechanism was held to rule every department of life. An essayist in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1898 as-

serted that this was one of the assured results of modern science. Everything seemed to agree with this proposition, and there was hardly a dissenting voice. We had none of the mass of proof which can now be marshaled against the mechanistic conception and which has relegated it into the domain of dead theories. Yet I cannot say that my faith in Christian doctrines was ever shaken by the materialistic world view which then held the floor, — not as a hypothesis, mind you, but as a datum of science, as little to be doubted as the law of conservation of energy, with which it seemed bound up absolutely. I was aware, of course, of a conflict of convictions and knew that only one line of thought could be the true one. But the "Gospel is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." I was not permitted to stumble and fall. I retained the inner conviction that the Gospel as we teach it is of divine origin and that all it tells us about human depravity and divine grace, about human inability and the saving power of the Spirit, is absolute, unconditional truth. I retained this faith because I kept close to the Word of God. Hence I believe that, even should new evidence be forthcoming supporting the evolutionistic scheme, I should remember the time when there seemed no escape whatever from a closed system of merely physical cause, excluding God from the creation and preservation of the universe. Nothing that evolutionists can produce will ever be more at variance with Christian faith. When Ramsey and Soddy made their experiments in radioactivity, no one dreamed even then that the death-knell of materialism had been sounded. The structure apparently stood as impregnable as Gibraltar. Now only a few obsessed fanatics like McCabe and other men without the least scientific standing still worship at that shrine. What a fool I would have been if I had thrown over the doctrines of Christianity under the influence of what was

then considered scientific truth! The entire outlook of science is the pragmatist one, as Millikan says in *The Electron*, p. 228, regarding the theory of non-radiating orbits that it is "one of the well-established truths of modern physics"; and then he adds: "For the present at least it is truth." We'll let evolution "for the present" be truth. I have had my experience with materialism which, "for the present" was truth.

5. GENESIS 1 AND THE GEOLOGICAL PERIODS.

You inquired November 8 regarding the possibility of retaining a person in our congregations who "persists in accepting the modern theory of evolution only in so far as the Genesis 1 account is concerned." You continue: "Does such a person forfeit his Christianity?" This assumes that we deny the Christianity of every one whom we cannot accept into our congregation. Certainly, none of us in Concordia Seminary teach what you call the "*dauernde-Handlung* theory of the creation." We believe in creation through a divine fiat; by His word the world and all living things were called into existence. We could not hold out the hand of brotherhood to one who denies this, the very heart of the doctrine of creation. Yet to declare absolutely that no one can have justifying faith unless he accepts every doctrine of Christianity would be going farther than the Lutheran dogmaticians and the fathers of our Synod have ever gone.

Regarding high-school teachers who have, as you say, espoused that "period stuff," I can fully agree with the attitude of those who are "up in arms and insist that these brethren come clean or get out of Synod." However, the invitation to leave the Missouri Synod is being brandished at the present time with considerable freedom, and I do

not believe that with such threats brethren can be won back who have been straying into strange pastures. Can we not argue questions of theology in our Synod without at the very outset pressing the six-shooter to the breast of our opponent? That attitude is a most efficient breeder of strife and division. I think we all need the warning of Gal. 6, 1.

6. FOR WHOM ARE THE TEN COMMANDMENTS?

In one of our church-papers I found these statements:
 1. "The Law on Mount Sinai was not given to all men."
 2. "It cannot be argued that whatever God commanded in the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai must be kept by all men." Now I would ask: 1. Are not the Ten Commandments as we have them in our Catechism the Mount Sinai commandments? Granted that the Sabbath law was a special law for Israel; yet our Third Commandment is given to all men, is it not? 2. If the Mount Sinai Law is not meant for all men, why, then, does our Catechism answer to Question 12: "Whom does God mean when in the Ten Commandments He says, Thou shalt" — "Me and all other men"? In short, how can the statement of the essayist "The Law on Mount Sinai was not given to all men" be made to harmonize with the answer to Question 12 in our Catechism, "Me and all other men"?

Both statements are true. The Decalog was given only to the children of Israel; the Decalog was given for all men. That the Decalog was legislation for the Jews particularly is clear from the chapter in Exodus. Luther in his sermons on Exodus very strongly emphasizes this fact. Hence, what is not reestablished by the New Testament as the will of God is not binding upon us. For this reason we omit the reference to graven images, to the Sabbath, and to "the land which the Lord, thy God, giveth thee."

On the other hand, that which is constant and universal in the Decalog is binding upon all men. No man has written upon his heart by nature a command to cease work on the seventh day of the week; but he knows that theft and murder are sin; he even knows that covetousness is a sin. The Reformed accept the Decalog in the Jewish sense. The Lutheran Church accepts it as interpreted and confirmed in the New Testament.

7. BAPTIZING THE CHILD OF AN EXCOMMUNICATED PERSON.

Is it permissible to baptize the child of an excommunicated person without the consent (possibly against the protest) of the pastor of the congregation which pronounced the sentence of excommunication?

Baptism is not to be refused in such a case when you are requested to perform it, since an excommunicated person may have his child baptized wherever he will.

8. INTRODUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUP.

Very little has been said in our periodicals about individual Communion cups. There are a few articles in the *Lutheraner* 1901, 1903, 1904, and *Lehre und Wehre* 1902, 1904. As you may surmise, the position taken in these articles to this innovation is negative. Personally I hold: 1) There is no need for the individual cup for hygienic reasons; precautionary measures (napkin, turning, etc.) with Communion cup suffice; there is no medical evidence of infection through a common cup; very probably the alcohol in the wine kills any germs that may stray into the cup. 2) All changes in church customs have a tendency to lower the hold which a church has on its people; there is a great element of strength in uniformity. 3) The individual cup will give offense to many sister con-

gregations. 4) The matter is not worthy the inevitable quarreling which will ensue when the matter is brought in the form of a resolution before a Missouri Synod congregation; we are not warned against the danger of contracting diseases in the Lord's Supper, but we are certainly warned against quarreling in our congregations. 5) Christians who insist that one cup at the institution means one cup at the celebration (drinking from a common cup at least, whether one of these or more) will not be readily convinced that a multiplication of cups to correspond to the number of individuals is Scriptural. Why should we disturb consciences? We have troubles enough as it is.

In regard to this practise we must concede that it belongs to the non-essentials of the Sacrament. The Sacrament is not destroyed by the variation in the mode of its administration. If the practise, abolished by the protests of Ph. J. Spener, of administering the wine through reeds or tubes, were to be reintroduced, the Sacrament itself would be unaffected. Nor would it be any the less the Lord's Supper if, according to ancient practise, the wine were largely diluted with water. These are non-essentials; but nevertheless they are matters of no light moment. The essentials of a Sacrament may be unaffected, while with it there may be practises interfering with its impressiveness, destroying reverence for a holy ordinance of God, disturbing the minds of devout communicants, and confusing the order of the Church.

Our Fathers, in the *Formula of Concord (Solida Declaratio*, X, 9) have declared: "We believe, teach, and confess that in regard to adiaphora the Church of God, of every time and place, has the fullest power, according to circumstances, to change, abrogate, and appoint anything, provided it be done without levity and offense, becomingly, and in good order, and that, at each particular time, regard be had to that which to the greatest extent

promotes good order, godly discipline, and the edification of the Church."

Some years ago the faculty of Philadelphia Seminary was requested to give an opinion regarding the Communion cup to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. It is found in the minutes of the 156th convention (1903) and is not only a well-reasoned piece of theological thinking, but to my mind brings out our conservative Lutheran stand in a most admirable manner. Let me copy out what it says on this point: —

"A change, even though it be in regard to matters that are of themselves adiaphora, which completely antagonizes and revolutionizes a practise sanctioned not only by the usage of the Church in all ages, in all lands, and under all confessions, where the cup has not been denied the laity, but also by the example of the apostles and the institution of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, should not be contemplated by individual pastors and congregations except in consultation and agreement with the churches with which they are synodically united. The good order of the Church and the edification of believers are not promoted by radical changes in the administration of the Holy Supper that occasion great diversities and contrasts among congregations that profess to stand in closest fellowship with one another. Wherever the practise is unusual, the mind of the communicant is withdrawn from 'the chief thing' in the Sacrament, the words 'for you,' to the innovation and to all the associations that have suggested, and the arguments urged for, its introduction.

"The historical practise observed by our churches teaches with great force and clearness the fact that, while our Lord, by the gift of His body and blood to the individual communicant, assures him individually of the forgiveness of sins, the Communion is not to separate, but to

unite, believing children of God with one another. As a pledge of such union, the Lutheran Order of Service lays particular emphasis upon the common cup. The exhortation in the Church Book and Common Service culminates in the words: 'For we are all one bread and one body, even as we are all partakers of this one bread and drink of this one cup.' The principle is not necessarily that of an entire congregation being restricted to but one cup at an administration, but that of a number of communicants drinking from the same vessel, as a testimony to the common bond that unites them in soul and body by partaking of the same Lord. What they elsewhere shrink from doing they cheerfully do here in recognition of their Lord's unspeakable love to them and to each, even the least and the vilest, of their brethren.

"As to the one argument upon which the innovation rests, that of the danger of incurring disease, the lists of the hundreds of thousands communing yearly in our churches and of the repetition of similar communions in all Protestant churches for nearly four hundred years now, since the Reformation, is a stronger argument than that urged by the professed scientific spirit of any particular age. If there be remote danger, this is found not only in the use of a common cup, but also in inhaling the same air, a peril which can be avoided only by completely isolating ourselves from our fellow-men.

"The refinements of modern life have, after all is said, probably more to do with the proposed change than even sanitary reasons. It must be acknowledged that, where proper precautions are not employed by pastors, there are abuses which give much ground for offense. Every possible care should be taken to cleanse the cup continually during the administration and to fulfil every requirement suggested by regard for cleanliness and decency. Ordinary

prudence will indicate that special attention should be given to communicants whose participation in a general Communion might, because of disease or other serious physical cause, render others reluctant to commune after them.

"With these precautions, there is no reason among us for deviating from the historical practise.

"Where variation from it occurs, a revision of the entire Communion service would be necessitated. The innovation is foreign and antagonistic throughout to the spirit of the Lutheran Church. Denominations in which the Lord's Supper is distributed, not by the pastor, but by church officers, through the pews or otherwise, for their own self-administration, can adopt the change far more readily than a Church which seeks most directly and immediately to reach the individual communicant with word and element applied through the pastor. The innovation sacrifices the individualization of the word to the individualization of the cup. Neither 'good order' nor 'godly discipline' nor 'the edification of the Church' requires or even advises it. Until a demand based on such reasons be recognized by the general agreement and official action of the Church, no individual pastor or congregation should yield to any sudden clamor for it and thus arbitrarily separate from the common and approved practise of the Church."

9. WINE OR GRAPE-JUICE?

When the question is stated as directly as you put it to me, I would say without any reservation that grape-juice should not be substituted for fermented wine in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. I would not partake of Communion where it is celebrated under that condition and would not affiliate with any congregation that introduced the use of grape-juice.

On the purely technical side of exegetical and dogmat-

ical aspects it is true that the exclusive use of fermented wine cannot be urged. If the question were put directly, Is the use of grape-juice *sinful*? Would we still have a Sacrament if we used grape-juice? our only consideration should be: What has our Lord established as the mode of celebrating the Sacrament? Is grape-juice — and by this is meant the unfermented juice of the grape — excluded by the terms of His words of institution? That fermented wine was used by our Lord seems beyond question, since in the Orient wine begins to ferment in a day or two. Yet we must not overlook the fact that Jesus calls the wine of the Sacrament by the general term "fruit of the vine." None of the arguments based on rabbinical lore have convinced me that this means only fermented wine. At any rate, the Lord would not establish an essential part of the sacramental act (as, for instance, the essence of the elements) on so obscure a point of Jewish usage. Dr. Walther on this matter is very careful. In his day the question of grape-juice had not yet arisen. However, in his *Pastorale*, page 168, he says that not only as to the bread, but also as to the wine the form of the elements is indifferent (*Mittelding*; "*wenn es nur ein Gebaeck aus Getreidemehl und Wasser ist*"; "*wenn es nur Trank vom Gewaechs des Weinstocks ist*"). Our theologians have never hesitated to answer with a *no* the other question, Would the use of leavened bread invalidate the Sacrament? By what line of reasoning are we compelled to deny a genuineness of the Sacrament because unfermented wine is used when we do not deny the validity when fermented bread is used? (The process of fermentation in both elements is the same chemically.)

But the above is said only with reference to the question of an absolute restriction of the sacramental wine to fermented wine. What has been said is not to be construed

as favoring the use of grape-juice. If you were to ask me, Shall we substitute the use of grape-juice for the use of wine? my answer would be an unhesitating *no*. I am personally opposed to the use of grape-juice in the Lord's Supper for four reasons: a) It is wrong to depart from the established usage of the entire Christian Church through all the centuries. b) Grape-juice is not fermented wine, and the use of it will raise in many people a doubt whether they are actually receiving the Sacrament, since to them the "fruit of the vine" has always meant, and means to-day, fermented wine. c) The use of grape-juice has been first advocated by Reformed sectarians, who condemn the use of all alcoholic liquor as sin. It is our duty to oppose this restriction of Christian liberty while it is in our power, not only by word, but by act, and for this reason to continue to use fermented wine in the Lord's Supper. d) The giving of offense involved in the above three points is an additional reason for refusing the use of grape-juice.

10. BREAD IN HOLY COMMUNION.

In my new charge I will be confronted with the problem of celebrating the Lord's Supper with bread and not with wafers. It seems to me that using the loaf would make a concession to the Reformed practise.

Not the use of loaf-bread, but its breaking is characteristic of Reformed doctrine. Certainly, if you merely use this kind of bread and do not break it during the administration, the concession is not to the Reformed doctrine, but to the customs of your people, especially when your other members know that these people accept the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Here the words of the Augsburg Confession must apply that matters of ceremony must not divide the Church. Personally I would not regard it against my conscience to break the bread during distribution as long as those who receive it have given

proof to the congregation that they believe in the Real Presence. A difficulty which would enter in would be the matter of giving offense; but to that you do not refer in your letter.

11. SELF-COMMUNION.

In a recent discussion in our conference the subject was broached, "May a minister give himself the Lord's Supper?" That which prompted the proposal of this question was the practise observed in certain U. L. C. churches and also the notation appended to the Episcopal service. I have been asked to make additional study of the question. On consulting Gerberding's notes, I found a rather weak-kneed, unsatisfactory answer.

Self-Communion is referred to in *Concordia Triglotta* 464, 8, with special reference to the Roman Mass. Our theologians have held that no pastor should commune himself secretly nor publicly without necessity. John Gerhard raises this question and quotes the analogy of Baptism, which a person never confers upon himself, and of absolution. The Sacrament cannot be a token of fellowship unless one person is communed by another. Yet cases of necessity are excepted, as when distance makes it impossible to invite or visit another person. In this case, says Gerhard, self-Communion should be permitted, the minister, as it were, receiving the Sacrament from the hands of Christ Himself.

12. WOMAN TEACHERS IN OUR CONFERENCES.

Your opinion regarding the attendance of female teachers at our mixed conferences finds me in entire agreement. At the semiannual mixed conferences in St. Louis the female teachers have long ago attended. I also agree with the reasons quoted in support of your opinion.

Now, as to the demand for the right of voice and vote.

When you refer to the voice, I distinguish between the right to speak from the floor and the right to address the conference with a paper, etc. What is to be said regarding both? The text from 1 Cor. 14, in the opinion of some commentators, refers to the hour of worship only or is at least limited to meetings for spiritual edification; that would exclude business meetings from consideration here. In other words, women are not to be religious teachers. I believe that more than this is meant, but the proof does not altogether satisfy me. In 1 Tim. 2 we have a text of wider scope; it condemns the assumption of authority. Naturally this broad principle also would prohibit the casting of votes by women on equal terms with men. It also prohibits the teaching of men by women in public assembly (not privately, as that was done in apostolic times), and while the reference is certainly to religious instruction, the question becomes a pretty delicate one as to how far also purely secular instruction by a woman would come under the description of "usurping authority." Manifestly we are on the safe side if we limit the expression of woman teachers both from the floor and from the platform to the easily defined group of public utterances: 1) questions; 2) statements of personal experiences, method, pedagogical viewpoints, etc., submitted for criticism and opinion.

The above is certainly not intended as a complete or adequate statement regarding the question proposed in your letter, but I think that practical needs may be met and the Scriptures safeguarded by applying this line of reasoning.

13. THE SECOND BLESSING AND THE UNSAVED.

What Methodists and the revivalists generally mean by the second baptism or baptism of the Holy Ghost is not so difficult to establish. In the report of a recent revival I notice the distinction between those who came "seeking

pardon" and those who were "seeking the experience of entire sanctification, or the baptism of the Holy Ghost." Here "baptism of the Holy Ghost" signifies more than receiving "pardon." But this conception we reject as contrary to the Scriptures. There is in this life no "entire sanctification"; we daily, even the best of us, transgress the Law of God and must daily pray for pardon. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," 1 John 1, 8. There is no "baptism with the Holy Ghost" beyond that experienced by the sinner when he is converted to God and in simple faith receives divine pardon. Whoever "stands up and testifies" to having received any special "baptism of the Holy Ghost" or "perfect sanctification" is deluding himself, and the truth is not in him. According to the report which you enclosed and which is typical of Methodist revival reports, it is asserted that the seeker finally, by cooperating with the Holy Spirit, attains to a certain feeling of blissful assurance and then proclaims himself "converted"; he is then "saved," the Holy Spirit has entered into him. And such outpouring has been attained by prayer. Those who have not passed through this experience are according to Methodist theology as yet "unsaved." The expression "unsaved persons" occurs regularly in Methodist periodical literature and preaching. Now, there are no unsaved persons. There is not a single unsaved person in the world. The atonement of Christ is all-sufficient. He has redeemed even such as resist His Holy Spirit and deny the Lord who bought them and finally perish, 2 Pet. 2, 1. The Methodist confounds redemption and conversion and then adds to these "perfect sanctification," or the "second conversion," "the baptism of the Spirit," "the second baptism," as it is variously called. Conversion is thus made to consist not in a sinner's acceptance, in true faith, of the merits of Christ offered in the Word and promises of God, but is

based upon an inner experience, consisting in a violent onrush of feeling. And this is the very nerve of revivalism and the heart of Methodist religion: the seekers profess to feel the Spirit descend into their hearts. When this occurs and they begin to crowd to the altar and testify that they have received the "second blessing," "a demonstration of the Holy Spirit's saving power" has rewarded the evangelistic effort. There is much man-made religion in Methodism. Fundamentally the doctrine that the Holy Spirit works upon the heart, not through the Word and the Sacraments, but directly, immediately, separates Methodism from the true Church of Christ, which "preaches, breathes, and teaches not but from His written Word."

In our theology we do not know anything of a second baptism with the Holy Ghost if that is distinguished in kind or degree from the conversion of a sinner; and we should not speak of "unsaved persons," because that either smacks of Calvinism or ignores objective justification, the pardon pronounced on all mankind when Jesus was raised from the dead.

As for the blessings of the Spirit, these are many, and the Lord Himself directs us to ask for the Holy Spirit in this sense, Luke 11, 14. It is He that gives us understanding and leads us into all truth, comforts us, and gives us the evidence of His indwelling, strengthens our prayers, and permits us to taste of the peace of God that passeth all understanding. All this through preaching and through reading the Word of God.

14. CAN A LUTHERAN BE SAVED IN A METHODIST CHURCH?

In connection with one of our Sunday-school lessons our class raised the question, Can a confirmed Lutheran join another Church (regular communicant membership), for instance, the Methodist, and be saved?

It is self-understood that in none of the arguments did any one suggest that the Lutheran Church is the only saving one; yet other opinions caused some doubt on the question. I shall state the various arguments to show to you the trend of the opinions and their reasons.

Those who answer the question in the affirmative held the opinion that if they could not be saved as a Methodist, they could not understand why any Methodists are saved. They would still belong to a Christian Church, considering that they held to the Scriptures as God's Word.

It was the argument of those who doubted if a Lutheran could be saved as a Methodist which caused difference. This argument is based on the oath of allegiance to the Lutheran Church given at confirmation. Can a person break an oath and be saved? That is a sin which needs repentance before forgiveness. How can a person break a vow and repent of it unless he tries to rejoin the Church to which he gave that vow before God? To some this sin would be a sin against conscience, and then it would be serious in its consequences unless forgiven. To some it may not be that, due perhaps to an erring conscience. Is that an excuse for such? Then also going to the Lord's Supper in such a church would mean confessing unity of faith with perhaps Modernists and as such would stand as a grievous sin for one who has learned better.

In case this question is answered in the negative, can we claim that others who have become members of other churches can be saved as Lutherans?

Your phrase "a grievous sin for one who has learned better" really contains the answer to your various questions. God judges man according to the light which he has. Because all have at least some religious light (Rom. 1), none are entirely excused. Jesus said that Capernaum will be more severely punished than ancient Nineveh, because its inhabitants sinned against better light.

As for the vow given at confirmation, if broken "against conscience," as you say, it would have the same consequences as any sin recognized, but not repented of. If one apostatizes although inwardly convinced that the Lutheran doctrine is true, his sin in breaking his vow is one against better knowledge and therefore excludes from the kingdom of God. The unionism which you mention with Modernists is a point not to be overlooked.

15. MINGLING CHURCH AND STATE.

Some of us have gone great lengths in raising the charge of mingling Church and State. A flag in the vestibule of the church and the words "In God We Trust" on the dollar have both been classified as contrary to the Scriptures and contrary to the American Constitution. Our ministers have sometimes gone much farther in this direction than did our fathers, who never claimed either on Scriptural or on constitutional grounds that absolute separation should exist between the two.

When does the State become guilty of action contrary to the law of separation of Church and State?

1) When it tries to prescribe to the Church what she shall teach.

2) When the State gives one denomination preferential treatment over another instead of treating all religious corporations alike without reference to creed.

How does the Church become guilty of confusing the principles which of right ought to govern the relation between Church and State in our country?

1) By the claim that the organizations of the Church should receive preferential treatment over other organizations, as when the Church demands immunity for her clergy by reason of their spiritual office. (*Council of Trent*, sess. XXV, chap. 20.)

2) By any form of political activity, that is to say, when congregations endeavor to regulate the affairs of the State by the doctrines of their Church and to this end employ citizens' functions and agencies of government.

Anything not included in these four propositions to my mind does not belong into the discussion of Church or State rights. The mistake generally made is that, when we speak of mingling Church and State, we may substitute religion for Church and politics for State and still have the same proposition. I have heard it said that, when the President of the United States takes his oath of office upon the Bible, that is an un-American mixing of Church and State!!

16. BIBLE-READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

This acknowledges receipt of your inquiry of December 1 regarding an expression in the *Lutheran Witness* of November 10, 1931, reading thus: "It is true that some of us hold that such practises are in violation of the separation of Church and State." The sentence refers to Bible-reading in the public schools. You say that the expression just quoted "sounds strange," and you ask: "Are we not all agreed, on the basis of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, that Bible-reading in the public schools should be prohibited?"

The editorial in question says nothing for or against the opposition of some of our clergy or laity to Bible-reading in the public schools. It defends against the U. L. C. charge of legalism those who protest against this custom. When you ask whether we are "all agreed," etc., my answer is: I believe that there is a rather unanimous sentiment among us on this point. That was not the question at issue. The question was whether those who hold such conviction should be condemned as "legalists."

Certainly we as a Church are not going to take an official attitude on a matter of American law. We can take as little an official attitude on this as on purely scientific or purely social questions. A Church that were to do such a thing would stultify itself.

If you will read Mr. Carl Zollmann's *American Civil Church Law*, you will find how precarious a footing there is for calling the practise of Bible-reading "un-American." As a matter of fact this practise was universal when the Constitution was adopted and for decades afterwards.

I do not want to be understood as favoring this practise. What I plead for is an attitude which will not involve us as a Church in interpretations of American law, unless indeed we find our own rights attacked.

Our Church in its earlier expressions distinctly favored Bible-reading in the public schools, and I should not want to have *Der Lutheraner* and its editors of 1870 condemned as publishing heresy when they published the following theses on "The Right Relation to Our American Public Schools": —

No. 16. "*Es ist fuer eine gnaedige Fuegung anzu-sehen, wenn in den Freischulen das Lesen der Bibel noch gesetzlich erlaubt ist.*"

No. 17. "*Wo Lutheraner nach den Gesetzen es tun koennen, ist es ihre Pflicht, dahin zu wirken, dass die Bibel aus den Freischulen nicht verbannt werde.*"

There are similar expressions in the old reports.

17. WITCHCRAFT TO-DAY.

The practises which you describe properly come under the general subject of witchcraft. In the language of science they belong into the field of the occult. The popular name is black magic. I shall assume that these phenomena are genuine and are not delusions or reports based on hearsay only.

There is an either — or. Either these practises are conscious frauds perpetrated on your people, or they are of supernatural origin. If the former, those who carry their money to these healers are committing an act of folly, aside from the unwholesome effect of such associations. If the latter, they are sinning against the plain prohibitions of Scripture. Whether fraud or genuine, the claims of these practitioners involve on the part of those who employ them a willingness to receive, by supernatural means, what God does not grant through natural means.

I am reminded by your letter of a remarkable interview which I had with one of these healers in the study of the sainted Dr. C. C. Schmidt. He called me by telephone and invited me to meet a man who claimed to have supernatural power and who was healing diseases by laying on of hands and prayer. How Dr. Schmidt had made contact with this man I do not now remember, but the meeting was for the purpose of establishing whether he could be received into communicant membership. The healer was a young man of about thirty and even more youthful in appearance, clean shaven, slender, and somewhat pale, with unsteady blue eyes, and a bit nervous in manner, but not annoyingly so. He claimed to possess the power of healing diseases without medicine or surgery. He healed cancer of the liver, Bright's disease, and tuberculosis simply by making passes with his hands and by praying over his patients. He would charge nothing, but usually received five dollars for a treatment. We asked him at some length as to his methods, and he gave us some rather startling information. The cause of disease, he said, was often some object that had been, by some occult manner, placed into the patient's bed. Sometimes he would find these objects in the pillow. We asked him to give us examples, and he replied: "Well, sometimes we find a little coffin in the pillow." "What,

a coffin?" we both exclaimed. Further question brought out the fact that these coffins consisted of a mass of feathers pressed together as by some great power until the shape of a coffin was exactly produced. When he would remove this object from the pillow, the patient would get well. In other pillows he would find a miniature reproduction of the diseased bodily organ, for instance, the heart or the kidneys. "What were these things made of?" "Of feathers," was the reply, and their removal invariably led to a recovery of health. "What kind of prayers do you use?" was our next question. He answered, "The Lord's Prayer, one of the psalms — any kind of prayer." Did he use the name of Jesus Christ? On this point he was not very definite. We received the impression that Christ's name was not used. In our consultation, after the man had left, Dr. Schmidt and I were fully agreed on these points: 1. The uncanny objects withdrawn from the pillows are non-existent or a product of the imagination and in any case could have no possible relation to the patient's state of health. 2. The claim of supernatural power is one made without divine promise, since it was promised to the believers only as a testimony to the authentic character of the Gospel. 3. The use of prayer and of Scripture-texts was purely mechanical and an attempt to make magical use of the Scriptures, without any reference to their meaning. 4. As far as the cures were concerned, both the Doctor and I knew enough about "faith cure" not to be influenced by these claims. Aside from the power of suggestion there was the well-known fact that 80 per cent. of all sicknesses get well of themselves — unless you give the patient arsenic! We agreed that the man could not become a communicant member.

You ask about the Scripture-proof against such practises. Let me assume that those cures are genuine. In

that case I would say that those who participate in them commit a sin condemned under the terms of witchcraft and necromancy in the divine Law; see Ex. 22, 18; Deut. 18, 9—12; 20, 16—18. These texts assume the possibility of persons' being able to exercise supernatural power through contact with evil spirits. Furthermore, those using occult means, incantations, and magic formulas set aside the Gospel promises and privileges which give us *everything* in the gift of God's Son, Rom. 8, 32. All that we need shall be granted as a fulfilment of prayer, and any attempt to secure by the use of occult power what God does not grant us in response to our prayers is something we obtain against His will and in the end will be a curse. As a matter of fact, those who once begin to use the healers as a rule continue to visit them for the relief of all ills and will in practise, if not by word of mouth, reject the Lord as the Physician of body and soul.

Personally I do not believe that there is much of a diabolical nature in these occult practises. Any text-book on abnormal psychology will make plain what I mean. One of the best recent works is Sadler's *The Mind at Mischief*; price, \$4.00; Funk and Wagnalls.

18. GOD RECONCILED TO US OR WE RECONCILED TO GOD?

As usually found in Scripture, the statement reads that we have been reconciled to God. As generally stated in our literature and preaching, it reads that God has been reconciled to us, that His wrath has been appeased. Our orthodox teachers point out that both must be exhibited, the love of God and the wrath of God. God loves us as His creatures; He is angry with us because we transgress His Law. His love is revealed in the sending of His Son into the flesh to be slain for us; His anger was wreaked in the

sentence of condemnation passed upon His Son. Our theologians distinguish *caritas generalis Dei*, revealed in His sending a Redeemer for all men, and *caritas specialis Dei*, the love of God for the redeemed soul, the effect of the reconciliation made through Christ. Hence, says Calovius, "it is in complete agreement with Scripture to say: Christ has reconciled God to us, and God, out of love for us, has sent Christ to become the Author of our reconciliation."

Young preachers, in treating the "reconciliation," are apt to stress the love of the Son as opposed to the wrath of the Father. The impression is made that the Father was bent upon executing His wrath upon the sinful world and was prevented from doing so only by the fact that the Son interposed His merits and, as it were, stopped the uplifted arm of justice which was about to descend upon the sinner. Such statements are at variance with the truth that the Father loved us before His Son died for us, 1 John 4, 10. A close study of the relevant texts will help you avoid a mode of presentation which ignores the fact that it was the love of the Father which caused Him to send forth His Son. Any orthodox commentary will be found to contain a full discussion of this difficulty; but such use of a commentary will be profitable only when the preacher has discovered for himself the difficulty, which is then found to disappear with a deeper comprehension of the texts.

19. THE BELIEVER'S SOUL AFTER DEATH.

While reading your article on "Christ's Descent into Hell — or Hades" in the "Lutheran Witness" of the first of July, an old question in my mind was revived. On page 244 you write: "Every soul at death goes either to paradise, if it has been good, or to torment, if it has been evil." I am far from wanting to challenge this statement. This is the

position I always held. But then the question arises, If the soul of the departed goes either to heaven or to hell immediately after death, must the soul of the believer leave heaven on Judgment Day in order to be reunited with the body? This may seem a peculiar question to you, but it has been placed before me very often.

As for the state of the souls of the believers after death, the difficulty of the interval between death and resurrection is to be viewed in connection with the teaching that in the spiritual world "a thousand years are as one day." With God there is neither time nor space, and those who have gone to heaven are in an order of existence similar to His. See also Matt. 17, 3. They will not be aware of any interval, for this reason, between their death and their reunion with their bodies. This is difficult for us to imagine and is only a deduction, but a valid one.

20. HISTORICAL PROOF FOR THE RESURRECTION.

You ask: "Why is profane history silent on the resurrection of Christ? Do you not think that an event as great as a person returning from death would be noticed by the historians?" By "profane" history you refer to the writings of the Greeks and Romans of that age. Do you realize that not one-tenth, nay, not one-hundredth of the writings of these nations have been preserved? I wish you would consult some good work of reference on the subject, *Library of Alexandria*, and there note the immense quantity of ancient writings that perished when the Mohammedans took that city. It is by no means certain that some Greek or Roman author has not made reference to the resurrection of Christ. In the second place, consider that the resurrected Lord appeared only to His disciples, only to men and women who believed in Him. Why did He not

appear to the unbelieving Jews and to the heathen Romans or Greeks? The question is answered in our Lutheran Catechism, where in the Third Article we confess that the Holy Ghost illumines our hearts and that by no other means faith can be produced. The unbelieving Jews saw the mightiest miracles of the Lord, but because they resisted the Holy Ghost, even these miracles could not make Christians out of them. According to God's plan of salvation it is the Holy Spirit, and He alone, who since Pentecost brings men to faith. He surely did testify mightily to the resurrection of Christ, so that in a short time the entire Roman and Greek world was filled with the Gospel.

21. PREDESTINATION.

How you could make this doctrine clear to your prospect I am unable to advise. You must assure yourself first of all that the man you are dealing with gives evidence of spiritual life; otherwise you cannot discuss predestination with him. But since he is interested in that subject, you would first of all have to make clear on what points we differ from Calvinism. He must be made to understand that our position is fundamentally different. On the other hand, we do not deny that there has been a real predestination unto eternal life. The Scripture is replete with references to an election of grace; you will at once recall Rom. 8 to 11 and Eph. 1. These texts describe election as an eternal act of God, by which certain ones were chosen out of the depraved mass of humanity unto salvation and final glorification. Election as treated in these texts concerns only those who are finally saved. The motive was solely divine mercy. However, redemption is universal, and salvation is offered to all who hear the Gospel. Christ died for all, His Spirit sincerely offers salvation to every reader and hearer of the divine Word. If some are lost, that is

due to their wilful resistance. If others are saved, that is due to the grace of God alone. Now, the difficulty which we recognize is this: how on identical premises (universal redemption and universal depravity) the result is so different. But we acknowledge this to be a mystery which Scripture does not solve.

It would be simple enough to say that some men conduct themselves better under the Gospel call; but this would be denying that all men are by nature unwilling to be saved on God's terms of free pardon; it would be making some men by nature less depraved than others, and this offends against the doctrine of original sin. It would also be very simple to say that God does not wish all men to be saved, but has limited redemption, grace, and the sincere invitations of the Gospel to a few, the elect, while the others are predestined to damnation. But this would deny the universality of divine grace. The solution lies in accepting both teachings without endeavoring to build a bridge between them.

Nor is there any difficulty if we consider each class separately. Every Christian, whether Lutheran, Reformed, or Catholic, rests his hopes for eternal happiness on the redeeming work of Christ, and that alone. In other words, all these Christians are saved by faith. Again, those who are lost have resisted divine grace, have refused the offer of pardon, and their conscience will not absolve them in the Judgment. They are lost through unbelief. On Calvin's proposition there must, by unavoidable conclusion, be some on Judgment Day who are saved against their will through irresistible grace. There will be others who desired salvation, but were unable to obtain it because of the divine decree that excluded them. It is a remarkable thing that Scripture does not contain a single text which can be quoted for these two propositions. The children of

God will attribute their salvation to divine grace alone, while those who are lost will be condemned by their own conscience as much as by the word of the omniscient Judge.

22. THE "NON-ELECT."

The "non-elect" are the ones that cause the trouble. You ask: "What of the non-elect? How can we avoid the conclusion that, inasmuch as God elected some to eternal life and only these are saved, the rest, who were not elected, must necessarily be lost?" You succeed in stating your point very clearly. One might go on and say that on Judgment Day there will be quite a number of people who will charge God with injustice for not having included them among His elect. They might as well have been predestinated to eternal damnation, as Calvin taught. They "had no chance."

Let me grant you that from the standpoint of pure logic you are absolutely right. All humanity is either elect, or it is not. None of the former can be lost. None of the latter will be saved. Again, if we can speak of the elect, we can include all the others under the term "non-elect." Logically one cannot assail such a division.

But what is logically correct is not necessarily true.

The Christian theologian must be careful not to multiply terms beyond those found in Scripture. Now, it is a strange thing that the Bible never speaks of "non-elect." It refers very often to the people whom you would include under this term, but it does not call them so. It refers to those who harden their hearts, who reject the Gospel, who serve Satan, to children of this world, unbelievers, those who finally are lost. It speaks of these in practically every book of the Bible. But it never calls them non-elect, not even in the letters to the Romans and to the Ephesians, which speak so fully about predestination.

Now, I would not say that the term non-elect is absolutely to be condemned. Some of the older theologians used it. Dr. Walther used it. But it is far from being an adequate term. It seems to imply that election had some reference or point in the final lot of unbelievers, as if, at least negatively, God had reference to their final end, if He did not actually determine their fate. Our doctrine of universal grace cries out against any such conception. That God wants all men to be saved, that all humanity was redeemed by Christ's blood, that the Holy Spirit employs the same means of grace with the same saving intent no matter to whom He offers the pardon of God, — all this is certainly based on the consistent teaching of Scripture. Hence any notion that would imply a "passing by" of certain ones of the human race in God's redemption scheme must be ruled out as unscriptural. The term non-elect is for this reason objectionable to me.

Now, as a matter of fact, the election of some has not robbed any of the others of any opportunity which they might otherwise have possessed. Compare the case of Peter and of Judas. Through their years of instruction as well as in the Passion Week, what opportunities were offered to Peter, what reminders, what warnings, that were not offered as fully to Judas? Can Judas on the Last Day say that he had no chance? By his suicide he held himself and no one else responsible for having "betrayed innocent blood."

It has often been said and bears repetition that, looked at separately, the two classes present no difficulty at all. The Christian will ever admit that his salvation is due alone to the grace of God. Of the others, we know that they pass up one opportunity after another and are finally lost because they "loved darkness rather than light." The difficulty arises when we compare the two classes and note

that they are by nature in the same state of corruption, also that the same grace is offered by the same Holy Spirit to all. Why, then, are some converted and some saved, others not? To this question we have no answer.

That God chose certain ones from everlasting to become heirs of salvation is taught many times in the Scriptures. That by this act He did not (implicitly or automatically or in any other sense) consign the others to perdition, so that all hope of their salvation was abolished by the election of the rest, is also clear. "What could have been done more to My vineyard that I have not done in it?" Is. 5, 4. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not!" Matt. 23, 37.

Whatever difficulties may arise in the contemplation of this doctrine are accounted for by the simple fact that the purpose, or decree, of predestination is an eternal act of God. To those indeed who imagine that "eternity" means nothing more than "endless time" there is no special significance in the words "*eternal* decree and purpose." Let it once, however, be understood that an "eternal" purpose is not merely a purpose formed "a long time ago," but is one that was formed in the counsel of the Trinity before space and time existed, and the necessity of this being a mystery and remaining a mystery must be evident. All our thoughts are circumscribed by time and space; we think all things as being somewhere and at some time; hence there is no difficulty in asserting that an event which occurred in a world so different from our own cannot be comprehended by mortal minds.

Nor let us for a minute suppose that the doctrine of election presents greater difficulties — when viewed in the light of human reason — than other teachings of Holy Writ. We are sometimes led to think so because within

our own memory this doctrine has been made the object of long-continued attacks. But we should remember that in time past other doctrines have been subjected to similar attacks, sometimes drawn out over decades and centuries. The difficulty in all is essentially the same; they are eternal thoughts expressed in human words. They are expressed with exceeding clearness and perspicuity; a child of ten years can grasp their essential import. But they are thoughts of an eternal Mind, and the highest power of human reason cannot attain to a full understanding of them. They must remain objects of faith until their full meaning shall be revealed in that glory of eternity whence they had their issue.

23. DID HE COMMIT THE UNPARDONABLE SIN?

I. THE INQUIRY.

(A Layman Writes.)

I am not a reader of your paper [the "Witness"], but I have read it and feel as if it is a good paper. The reason I write is because I am in a fearful condition, having committed the unpardonable sin, as I feel I have, and want to ask if there is any help for me to get peace and Jesus. I can't get to God because the Holy Spirit is not with me, and oh, how I have sought and sought and sought! I must have help or die, and God is the only one that can help me; and if by constant sinning against light I have driven the Spirit from me, how in God's name can I be saved? I hear of others who say they are happy in Jesus, but as for me there is no peace, no joy, no hope, but condemnation, fear, and sorrow with awful heartaches and soul sickness. Tell me, what is blasphemy against the Holy Ghost? Matt. 12, 31—45 speaks of it, and v. 45 says the last state of the man is worse than the first. My sad experience is professing Christ without finding peace, openly professing him in

church when I never found Him. My parents were good Christian people, but they never knew enough when I came to the altar to see or be sure that I had light; but I was taught foolishly to testify before I found Him; there is where my trouble started. You can readily see at a glance that I sinned against light. Now, won't you pray for me and my wife and children? Oh, please do for God's sake pray for God to send His Spirit to me; please, oh, please do! I feel cut off entirely, and my dear wife is awfully worried about my condition. But please, oh, please ask God to help me,—please do! Pray for my dear children, please. Oh, what a fearful thing to be lost, lost, eternally lost! My dear brother, if my own father had only been sure my soul was saved while he lived! Oh, how crafty the devil is! He fooled me, he certainly did. Dear brother, won't you please, please ask God to deliver me from the power of the devil. For if He don't, I am bound for eternal hell. Please, brother, pray for God's peace to rest on my home. Now you may wonder why I ask you people to pray for me away out there, but the reason is that I believe you have the Holy Spirit with you. Now forgive me for asking you this favor, but I must have Jesus. Oh, why is there any unpardonable sin? Some people say there is no unpardonable sin, that everything God will forgive. Oh, what mistakes we make! If God will forgive people I know who, I have heard, have been so wicked, why, He must save me. I know of a man who was a leader in the church and teacher of a Sunday-school, who was constantly committing adultery with another man's wife, and the Lord has saved him, and to-day he is a shining light; so why not save me who am no worse than he? Don't you think it possible for Him to so bring my heart and mind in touch with Him? Please write me and please pray for me to be taken out of Satan's power.

II. A REPLY.

I have your lines of March 22. Your condition is serious, but it is not incurable. Indeed, the cure is so close at hand that for very nearness it is possible that you have missed it. Do you not see that the very fact that you desire peace and forgiveness is the best proof, nay, is certain and absolute proof, that you have not committed the sin against the Holy Ghost? You say you have sinned against light; but your letter proves to me that you have the light; you know and realize that only the grace of God can help you, that you can do nothing, that you must be damned if you are to be without the help of His Spirit. Now, that is exactly the attitude that God wants. Indeed, He wants nothing more. He does not ask a special degree of sanctification before He forgives sin; He does not demand of you that you make amends before He grants you His grace; all He wants is a contrite spirit, clamoring for grace and pardon, absolutely nothing else. What did the prodigal son have when he came home to his father? Nothing, absolutely nothing. Yet he was received with joy. Certainly God wants us to lead holy lives, He wants us to fight sin in our members and that, whenever we have offended and injured others, we make amends. All this a Christian will do; but a Christian is one who repents of his sins and believes that Jesus has fully atoned for them, so that there is nothing left for him to do, only to accept Him.

The unpardonable sin is the sin committed by those who have received the truth of God, have recognized it as the truth, but because of their love of sin suppress the testimony of the Spirit, refuse to acknowledge the truth of His teachings, yea, rather oppose it; and who have done this so long, so stubbornly, so persistently and with so much malice that finally God withdraws His Spirit. Then,

indeed, they can have no forgiveness; why not? Because they do not want forgiveness; they are hardened in their enmity against God and against the Gospel. Remember, the mark of a person who has committed this sin is that he loves sin and that he does not desire pardon. He is perfectly happy in his ungodly condition; he is not anxious about his soul's salvation; he is thoroughly hardened. Now, this description does not at all fit your case. You may have "sinned against light," as you say; but the very fact that you desire comfort, that you are miserable, crushed down, almost despairing, proves that God has not withdrawn His Spirit from you; He has not given you over into impenitence. Just cling to this truth: "Christ has died for all sinners; I am a sinner; hence He has died also for me, hence He is my Savior, I am His child, and I have all reason in the world to be happy." I am enclosing an article which you will enjoy reading; please return it. Will you not call on our pastor in D., Rev. —? He will be able to comfort you and point out the way from these doubts that are besetting you. Certainly I shall pray for you, and what is more, I know that God will give you a cheerful, happy heart, since He has promised to give His Spirit to all who come hungry and thirsting for righteousness.

III. EXPLANATIONS.

Received your letter to-day and am very glad to hear from you and thankful to know there are good, conscientious people yet in the world, even though strangers in the flesh. I have read the paper you sent me and have read it again, and I notice that my experience is not altogether fitting with the article written thereon, or vice versa. I don't want to make any comment on it in particular, only in this respect — the article deals with souls who have received the blessing of the knowledge of sins forgiven and

then fell and rejected the Holy Ghost until forsaken by same, or who have continually rejected the striving of the Holy Ghost after having every reason to know that Jesus is the Christ until forsaken by same; but my case is of a different type from either. While I was anxious to have my sins forgiven and believed in Christ as the Savior of the world, yet for some reason God didn't grant me believing faith because I did not absolutely surrender, nor did I know how to grasp the situation yet, having a knowledge within myself all the while I wasn't accepted and knowing I hadn't believed. But the foolish, the most foolish, thing a person could do was to profess faith and salvation without first receiving it; and then to duplicate my first experience is what gives me light, yes, all kinds of light. But is the light in me light or darkness? If darkness, how great is that darkness? You see, dear brother, there is where my difficulty lies. It may be the wrong spirit that has dealt with me, for I could not possibly discern between the spirits; for, you see, Matt. 12, 31—45 is a picture of a blasphemer rejected of the Holy Spirit, but being entered and controlled by a devil, and seven others more evil than he also enter with him; and of course, while Jesus could command them to come out, but the person himself could not meet the conditions to be freed from their power. Or this picture of Matt. 12, 31—45 is a picture of a soul absolutely cut off from God and thrown over into Satan's hands; or like the message St. John had given to him when he was in the isle of Patmos, when Jesus said to him: I know the blasphemy of them who say they are Jews and are not, but are of the synagogue of satan. Behold, I will throw them into Satan's hands.

Now, I don't know that I am, or ever was, as bad as those Jews; but for one year next May I have felt as if some terrible power has taken a hold of my being, and

I am exactly like a man who feels (how will I explain it?) or dreads the power to which he has fallen victim and striving without hope to get back to a power that once held him safe from the power which now seems to own and control him.

Don't forget to ask God for my family, please; I have a lovely home, wife, and three children.

You spoke about speaking to Rev. B., and of course I will. I am in the postal service, and I took a letter to him to-day from you, for it was just like mine in handwriting. I thought you might write him, but you would rather have me not know that you informed him about me. I thank you more than ever for your kindness and thought, and may God bless you and yours for your kindness! I don't belong to his church. I am a Methodist, but I am not at all built on sectarian lines; so when he makes himself known to me, if he does shortly, I will be pleased to talk with him, and if he don't seek me, I will him surely. Thanking you for your brotherly love to me, I will beg to remain sincerely. . . .

IV. CONSCIENCE OR HOLY SPIRIT?

A few lines to you concerning the interview held with Rev. B. of D. I visited his home April 7 and found him a very fine man. I know his view of my spiritual condition is not the same as mine is.

I couldn't make him believe I had blasphemed the Holy Ghost on account of my knowledge of the subject, which he questioned on all sides and from all angles. My conception of the unpardonable sin to his mind was correct, but having the light on all questions concerned, he couldn't see how I placed my life in such a foolish position. But I came away unconvinced against his decision. What puzzles him is my correct conception of the subjects touched

upon. Of course, this would come from being brought up under Christian teaching. I asked him to define the difference between blasphemy and hypocrisy, and he said when I wrote you to mention the subject to you for your solution or theory, I told him there is no particular difference as both are the same in the dictionary. Irreverent attitude toward the Holy Spirit can be blasphemy or hypocrisy, for both are contrary to a man's inner conscience, which must be a warning from the Holy Spirit. I contended that a profession of faith in Christ (publicly), if false or contrary to knowledge of conscience, is blasphemy. My own foolishness of allowing Satan to fool me in the beginning of my life is now the result. There is absolutely no excuse for me at all, only on one ground; and yet that is so shallow I hate to tell it. If I had been half as wise as I am intelligent in matters concerning the things of time, I would not be here. Now, dear brother, there is nothing you can do for me; but if you still believe I have not cut myself off, you can pray for me; but if you believe I have disinherited myself, don't do it. One thing I say is that Jesus Christ never to my knowledge spoke peace to my soul, but I made a profession of salvation just the same, which I should have withheld until sure of the fact. I would never have made a profession, only people led me to believe a profession would bring desired results; but when it didn't, I should have had sense enough to know and stop. But I kept right on like a foolish man and never got the assurance of salvation; and then to duplicate my first experience was madness and lacking wisdom. If blasphemy is worse than that, it must be terrible. Although I didn't seek a selfish end in so doing, I honestly wanted Christ, and to-day I want Him and need Him more than ever before in my life. Thanking you in advance, I beg to remain. . . .

V. THE PASTOR WRITES.

Some time ago Mr. P. visited me as you requested. He happens to be my postman and knew that I had received a letter from you on the same day he did. I therefore showed your letter to him, which was of course a copy of the letter sent him. I had a long talk with him and found him to be well versed in the Bible, and although a Methodist will not agree with us in many points, he believes as we do concerning the Lord's Supper.

His trouble is of long standing and briefly is this, He was in some meeting, I believe a revival meeting in his church, when some one just about pulled him up before the congregation to confess he had Christ in his heart. This he did, feeling, though, at the time that it was not true. That he did this always troubled him. Then, if I remember correctly, he fell away from the church for some time, but eventually came back and again confessed Christ, again, however, with the same feeling. This, he seems to think, is the unpardonable sin,—or may be,—and he cannot ease his mind about it. He has spoken with several ministers; one even came from New York to speak to him, and he himself went to some noted minister in Philadelphia; and every one of them, including myself, told him that he did not commit this sin. He appears to believe the devil has him in his power. He says he believes the Bible from cover to cover. He knows that his deeds are of no avail. He says he prays, but it seems to him as if there were a dark cloud between him and God which his prayer could not penetrate. I tried with Scripture and examples of men in Scripture to convince him that he had not committed the unpardonable sin; but when he left, he was still in doubt. He quoted a passage from Revelation, but not exactly, which I was not able at the time to find with the aid of my concordance, and I did not think of

asking him to find it. Since then I believe I have found the passage, namely, Rev. 3, 9. He compares his case with that one. They said they were Jews and were not. He confessed in that meeting he was a Christian and says he was not and felt he knew he was not. The passage reads: "Behold, I will make them of the synagog of Satan," etc. He believes God has given him over to Satan. He claims he did not want to go up and confess, but was practically forced. His confession was hypocrisy. And this hypocrisy he looks upon as the unpardonable sin. He thinks it might help him if a clear distinction were made to him between hypocrisy and blasphemy. He looked up the words in a dictionary and thinks they are identical.

I suppose he has written you some time ago, but if he has not asked the question of you as to what the distinction is between those two words, I know he would appreciate it if you would make this clear to him. If you could help him in seeing the difference between his case and Rev. 3, 9, it might help him ease his mind. I personally cannot see how he can apply it to himself though I have not given it much thought. I have Matthew Henry, "Pulpit Commentary," and Starke, but there is little on that verse. What does "synagog of Satan" mean? Rev. 2, 9 is very similar to Rev. 3, 9.

As I look at the verse again, I see no difficulty in it; yet he does, and you could show him this better than I could. If you write him on these points, I will speak and pray with him again. I should like to see him clear his mind of his trouble.

VI. THE SYNAGOG OF SATAN.

Mr. P.'s case as described by you agrees with my impressions as gained from his letters. Rev. 3, 9 surely does not supply any grounds why the man should be worried in his conscience. "Synagog of Satan" means no more than the

religious unity of those serving the devil; it is another expression for "kingdom of darkness."

All this man needs is to hear the Gospel frequently as preached in all its simplicity. The devil, taking advantage of Reformed fanaticism, has twisted his mind, and it takes the clear promises of the universal Gospel to straighten him out.

Remind him of the rash promise of the disciples, Mark 10, 39, and the gentle answer of our Lord; of the forwardness of Peter, Luke 22, 31—34. Maybe it will help him.*

* The above correspondence has been reprinted without omissions of any kind on account of the insight which it gives into the comparatively rare case of one who believes that he has committed the sin against the Holy Ghost.

III. BIBLICAL PROBLEMS.

1. THE ANIMALS IN NOAH'S ARK.

Considering the dimensions of Noah's ark and the large number of species of animals then in existence (many species which now have died out) and the necessary provisions, how could all these species find room in the ark?

I have no doubt as to the possibility, but I'd like to know what to answer to this question.

Your question hinges on a definition of species. If each member of the cat tribe was there, tiger, lion, leopard, jaguar, lynx, house-cat, etc., the number was very large. Unquestionably all these animals are of one type, they are simply cats, and I do not believe that every feline species was represented in the ark except by major type. Remember that there are again many varieties of lions, of house-cats, and similarly among the dog family, the cattle, the pigeon, etc., etc. These varieties hardly are species in the Biblical sense. As for the great monsters, the dinosaurs, the brontosaurus, etc., it is certainly absurd to think that Noah had these creatures in the ark. There is no sign that they lived after the Flood. They may have been extinct when the Flood came. I am unable to say anything positive on this point. The more I study the history of the Flood, the more simple and consistent the whole narrative seems to become. As to details, how the animals were kept and fed, we cannot even speculate. We know nothing.

2. A DIFFICULTY IN THE LAW OF SACRIFICE.

We are at present studying the Bible history of the Old Testament. When we treated the sacrifices, one of my members asked a rather puzzling question. He imagined

a situation like this: At 9 A.M. the morning sacrifice, at 3 P.M. the evening sacrifice was offered up. After the morning sacrifice three Israelites come to the priests, each having a bullock for a burnt offering. That means one lamb and three bullocks would be burnt on the altar inside of six hours. Now he asks — were they totally burned, reduced to ashes, or merely partly? He believed that the former was the case, and I concurred. Then he asked how it was possible to reduce four carcasses to ashes in so short a time. His question was prompted by the following incident. His father is a baker. One day one of their cats died, and having no way to dispose of the carcass (they have no back yard), they threw it into the fire which heats the ovens. In spite of the fact that the fire was good, it took nearly an hour to reduce it to ashes. Now, if it takes an hour for a cat, how much longer would it take for a bullock? Did they have a special kind of fire? No. And the altar of the Tabernacle was not very large, about 7×7 feet, etc. I told him that I never witnessed the burning of a carcass and could therefore not say from experience how long it would take, but that I would try to answer his question for him. I can't find any information on the subject. It is true that raw flesh takes a long time to burn. The fire on the altar would therefore have to be a very hot one. Does the size of the altar permit this? The Lord Himself designed the altar, and hence it would serve its purpose. That should settle the matter for Christians. Nevertheless I should like to have a little more information on this point.

You ask about the possibility of reducing to ashes the animals of the morning and evening sacrifice in the Old Testament ritual. Certainly these particular offerings were reduced to ashes. While in most of the prescribed offerings the priests received a large share of the meat, etc.,

this was not the case with the morning and evening sacrifice, the atonement offering, and others. However, it is plain that these large animals were cut into small pieces before they were laid upon the altar. See Lev. 1, 6. 12. The *Jewish Cyclopaedia* describes in detail the ceremonial, each priest bearing one small piece of carcass to the altar and casting it on the flames.

3. SAUL IN THE CAVE OF ENDOR.

Was it really Samuel that appeared before Saul, or was it the devil in the form of Samuel? In either case, why was the witch able to call up this apparition?

Saul had sinned against better knowledge for many years, had hardened his heart, and it need not surprise us that God permitted the devil to deal with him as described in this chapter. Since the witch was surprised at the appearance of a person that really looked like Samuel, it seems plain that the devil took the figure of the prophet and then spoke as recorded. It is a case of God's giving the devil permission to deal on their own terms with those who have hardened their hearts against the truth.—You will, however, find that some orthodox interpreters, also some teachers of our own Synod, have held that Samuel actually was permitted to appear in order to pronounce judgment upon the king.

4. SACRAMENTS OLD AND NEW.

In our conferences the question has arisen: If the Sacrament of Baptism is "typified by the rite of Circumcision in the Old Testament," why must all people be baptized? Or putting it this way: Why was it not necessary for the females of the Old Testament to have a special Sacrament applied to them? At first I contended that Circumcision and Baptism were two distinct ordinances and had nothing in common. But after looking up perti-

nent passages in works of reference, I find that these insist that the one is the continuation of the other and that Circumcision ceased when Baptism was instituted.

The Scriptures do not say anything about the relation of Circumcision to Baptism. The most that we should claim for Circumcision is that it presents an analogy to the Sacrament of Baptism. The points of difference, however, are so numerous that for any purpose of argument the analogy is quite worthless. You have pointed out one in your letter, and there are others. I have also misgivings about the easy identification of the Passover with the Lord's Supper as the second Sacrament. To the believing Jew the Passover was indeed a memorial of God's mercy when Israel was afflicted in Egypt. In a sense we have a visible token in the paschal lamb combined with an invisible grace. But the same holds good of every one of the Old Testament sacrifices, the entire institution of priesthood and Levites. Not only the rite of Circumcision and the celebration of the Passover, but the entire Old Testament dispensation was terminated through Christ's work.

I have no objection to the application of the word Sacrament to these ancient Jewish ceremonies, but we should recognize that we are using Sacrament in a wider sense than is involved in the New Testament usages and that the Scriptures do not represent our Christian Sacraments as a substitute for the Old Testament ordinances.

5. MIRACLES.

You are meeting among your college youth some who have absorbed skeptical views regarding the miracles of the Bible. How is one to meet their doubts? Do I know of any apologetic texts which they might read with profit?

There are such texts, and there is a historical argument for the authenticity of the miracles of Christ. But no text in apologetics, no rational argument, will avail against

doubts that arise out of unbelief. There is only one cure, and that is the use of the means of grace — reading the Bible for devotion, hearing the Sunday sermons, prayer, Christian counsel; nothing else will do. However, it may strengthen one who has thus been regained for the faith of Christendom if he is directed to the historical argument for the genuineness of the miraculous element of Scripture.

The resurrection of Jesus is the central miracle of the Bible; and this miracle has not only been verified by a large number of witnesses, but these witnesses were near enough in point of time to the events to be fully informed of this miracle of the resurrection of Christ. Their character is unassailable. None of them had any sort of temporal or personal interest to serve by their contention that Jesus had risen from the dead. If self-deceived, Jesus' disciples were fanatics, whose weakness of judgment verged on idiocy. But how could such half-demented romanticists, in whose morbid brains dream and reality were crudely blended, compose a book from which as from no second streams the spirit of refined tastes, ineffaceable originality, and marvelously perfect morality?

But we have more direct evidence of the actual occurrence of miracles. Let us take the four letters of Paul which have been accepted as genuine even by the most extreme higher critics — the two epistles to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Galatians, and the Epistle to the Romans. Take Second Corinthians. This letter proves that the congregation was being incited against Paul by bitter personal enemies. How does he meet their slanders? He appeals for the confirmation of his divine mission simply and solely to the miracles which he had performed in Corinth before their own eyes. Only four years had elapsed between the miraculous deeds of this apostle and his written appeal to them as evidence for his apostleship. These miracles must

have been a generally recognized fact in the community, otherwise Paul could never have so naively adduced them as proofs of his divine mission to a church that had in the mean time grown critical. Look up 2 Cor. 12, 11—13 and compare with this text 1 Cor. 2, 3—5. Once more, Paul appeals to the Galatians (chap. 3, 5) as follows: "He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the Law or by the hearing of faith?" This letter was written in the year 53 A. D., and the apostle speaks of his miracles as well known to, and recognized by, both factions. At both places there were enemies who would have welcomed any opportunity to discredit St. Paul. Unless he had actually performed miracles, he could not have flung these claims into their teeth.

The entire argument for the historical character of New Testament miracles is set forth by Ludwig von Gerdtehl in his book *Miracles under Fire*. (I am interested in von Gerdtehl because he spent a day in my office, and I got to know him as a very learned man, with doctor degrees in theology and philosophy from three German universities.)

The unique character of Christ's miracles has never to my knowledge been set forth more convincingly than by A. M. Fairbairn in *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*.

Possibly you will be encouraged to study those pages in Fairbairn's book if I describe to you in outline the argument there set forth. It is pointed out first of all that the miraculous acts which are ascribed to Jesus have qualities which curiously correspond to His character. In other words, they so duplicate and reflect it that the moral attributes which are most distinctive of Him reappear in His acts. There is nothing about them of the weird or the uncanny, that which in German we call *unheimlich*.

They are sane. Mythical miracles usually are fantastic, even childish, as when St. Gregory caused gold pieces to fall from heaven or when the Virgin held up a hanged thief for two whole days. The miracles of Jesus, on the other hand, though supernatural, are not contranatural. He heals the blind, the halt, the lame, the sick of the palsy; He brings comfort to the widow who has lost a son, to the Gentile nobleman whose son is at death's door; He creates joy in the heart of the woman who had sought counsel of many physicians and had only grown the worse for all their attempts at healing. "He goes through life like a kind of embodied beneficence, creating health and happiness." In a sense, His miracles are but the transcripts of His character, the symbol of His mind and mission. They give us an impression of the supernatural, so objective and realistic as to be without any parallel in all literature. The recognition of Christ's miraculous will is universal. All the men who surround Him believe that He possesses it; they see Him exercise it; they crave, though they never attempt to bribe Him, that He exercise it on their behalf. The enemies question His right to forgive sins, but not His power to heal diseases. They have indeed a theory as to the sources of His power — He does it by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. But is not this the most remarkable tribute they could pay to His self-control? Would they have ventured to attribute to the devil in Him the power which they acknowledged that He possessed if they had thought that His will was really devilish? Would they not have spoken softly and called Him by the gentlest names they knew if they had actually believed that He was an embodiment of the Evil One?

Next we consider the marvelous restraint and sanity of the Gospel-story recording these miracles. If we were to describe the character and career of such a person, what would we have done to make the picture consistent?

Would we not picture him as a being of such superhuman majesty that no ordinary person ever would dare to address him? Would we not represent everything that he did as abnormal, stupendous, and thus incredible like the miracles of the medieval saints? But how do the gospels deal with this problem? In the most surprising way. He who is conceived as "the Word become flesh" is represented as the most natural character in all literature. In Him there is nothing obscure, dark, or mysterious; He seems to lie all open to the day. His words are simple and plain; His thought is always clear and never complex. He is the last person who could be described as a man of mystery. He does not study or practise any art of concealment. He calls His disciples, and they live with Him, and He lives with them as a man among men. "His is the common, every-day, familiar humanity which suffers and rejoices, knows sorrow and death. But this humanity is all the more divine that it is so natural; it is man embosomed in the eternal, a nature transfigured by the indwelling supernatural." The evangelists tell their tale, they report the words of their Master, and then they leave their history and their logia to sink into the reason and wake the wonder of men.

6. THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

With reference to the troubling of the water, John 5, the statement is made that an angel was the cause of this condition. I have now been asked by one of my parishioners whether it has not been discovered that a siphon in the bed of this pool was the cause of this condition and not a supernatural agency.

That a siphon in the bed of the Pool of Bethesda was the cause of the stirring of the waters is a "new one." I have consulted six of the most recent books of reference, — none of them Lutheran by the way, — and there is no

hint anywhere that any scholar has ever expressed the theory that such a siphon was at the bottom of the mystery. You may ask your parishioner to discard that idea as one of the lies invented against the New Testament by radical infidels.

7. THREE WOULD-BE DISCIPLES.

Luke 9, 57—62.

I have always considered the incident in 1 Kings 19, 21 a wonderful parallel. The difference in attitude accounts for the Savior's directions on that occasion. Three men wanted to become disciples; one thought it too easy, and two could not make up their minds. The first showed every readiness to become a follower of Christ, but he had not considered the cost and for all his eagerness was really unprepared to join the Savior's ranks. A life of self-denial was not what he expected. The second hesitated to follow the call; he had to attend a funeral first. Him the Lord recognized as one who must choose at once, or without doubt he would never choose: "Go right now and preach the Gospel; let those who do not believe in Me attend to a duty which would cause you to forget your noble purpose." The third was a case of a divided heart, known as such to the Savior by His ability to read the thoughts. His words to this man simply mean that you cannot draw a straight furrow in the kingdom of God unless you keep your eyes straight forward.

8. SIGNS OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

How are the signs mentioned by our Lord as announcing His second advent, Matt. 24 and Luke 21, to be understood? Are they constant reminders, or are we to expect these phenomena to occur on the very eve, or threshold, of the Day of Judgment?

Concerning some of these tokens it would appear that Jesus has in mind phenomena which are to occur immediately before His return to judge the world. Thus the darkening of the sun and moon and other startling events in the firmament are to be expected "immediately after the tribulation of those days." However, most of the signs are given as reminders of the fact rather than of the nearness of Christ's return. They are to keep us in a constant state of preparation by reminding us continually that we are living in the last age of the world.

It is interesting to note that even with regard to the ungodly these signs fulfil their purpose. They may not be accepted as a call to repentance, yet they are what the Lord intended them to be, signs of the end. On December 17, 1920, there was an extraordinary phenomenon in the heavens. Under the moon's crescent there hung five planets, stretched over one half the sky, and a sixth joined them just before sunrise. Three were plainly visible — the white blaze of Jupiter overhead, next the red disk of Mars, and sloping down the horizon the intense radiance of Venus. When this conjunction occurred last, Christ's first advent had not yet been heralded to the shepherds. An Italian astronomer predicted that these six planets, pulling all in one direction, would cause the earth to wobble and crack and possibly pitch into the sun. Next morning all the godless scoffers in the world, still a little blue around the gills from a restless night, told their Christian friends what fools the believers of the Bible are, — "Pah, world come to an end, tush!" and "Fiddlesticks!" and "I should worry!" etc., etc. Nevertheless, these signs in the heavens did remind the scoffers of Judgment Day. They did tremble for a moment or an hour lest the Son of Man come. So, though quite natural in its origin, even as natural as the budding of the fig-tree referred to by Christ where He

speaks of these signs, Luke 21, this conjunction of planets, this rarest of heavenly phenomena, caused men to scoff with a bravado that was to hide inward shudders and caused others calmly to meditate on the blessed Second Advent, the final salvation. Even so the Great War was a sign of the Latter Days. The Jews living before our eyes are such a sign. Even so all unusual occurrences in the sky and on the earth are signs, reminding men, believers and unbelievers, of the end. At the time of the San Francisco earthquake I lived in Red Wing, Minnesota, and I can still see a young fellow rushing from a printing-office to the adjoining drug store and shouting, "Hey, boys, hear this? The world's coming to an end; San Francisco is destroyed by an earthquake!" Again a sign.

Among the signs foreshadowing the end these are mentioned: "upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring." "And great earthquakes shall be in divers places." Nothing could better summarize the world situation as it is to-day than "distress of nations with perplexity." Only recently the news came from South America of "great earthquakes in divers places, the sea and the waves roaring." Loss of property running into millions, destruction of lives mounting into thousands, are reported from the western coast of our sister continent. Tidal waves twelve hundred miles in length dashed into the land, destroying harbors and shipping. There was reported an actual settling of the Andes Mountains, so that peaks became visible beyond which formerly had been hidden from sight. More lately we have had tremendous volcanic eruptions that spread terror among millions of inhabitants of Argentina. By their violence and destructiveness and man's helplessness in the presence of these phenomena they are signs to the world of the terrors of the Judgment.

9. THE "TO-DAY" OF JESUS ON THE CROSS.

Luke 23, 43 records the words of the Crucified One, "This day shalt thou be with Me in paradise." You have met with the interpretation which places the phrase "to-day" in connection with the preceding verb. The meaning then would be: "I say to thee to-day."

The question whether "to-day" refers to the foregoing or following verb is not even touched upon by the commentaries of Professors Weiss and Noesgen, by the *Pulpit Commentary*, the *Lutheran*, the *Comprehensive*. In the *Proof-texts of the Catechism* (*Theological Quarterly*) it is stated that Adventists punctuate after "to-day" because they deny the immortality of the soul. However, the evident sense of the Savior's remark is that instead of the indefinite *ὅταν* ("when Thou comest") it states emphatically, "To-day," this very day, "thou shalt be with Me." The comma behind *σήμερον* was even 400 A. D. inserted by those who denied Christ's divinity. The ancient versions all favor the connection of "to-day" with the following. The pleonasm which results from a combination with the preceding is to my mind quite intolerable and would never be suggested except by those who have some false idea about the life hereafter.

10. MAY WOMEN ATTEND CHURCH WITH UNCOVERED HEADS?

The reference to women attending divine service without a head-covering, 1 Cor. 11, lays down a rule for the congregation in the apostolic time only, since in that age decent women appeared in public with their heads covered. It lays down no rule for our age, but establishes the general principle that decency and a proper regard of social form should prevail in the house of worship. You will find the matter fully discussed in any commentary on First Corinthians.

11. FAITH-HEALING.

Zionist elders (Dowieites) are troubling my people and then making an impression with their reference to Jas. 5, 14 ff. quoted in support of their opposition to doctors and in support of their healing by faith and prayer. The interpretation of these verses gives me some trouble. V. 14: How sick is the person? Who are the elders of the congregation, and what is their capacity? On what particular occasions or in what sicknesses should one call the elders? "Praying over him" — what for? "Anoint with oil" — before or after? Is the olive-oil to allay the fever? Or is its use on this particular occasion due to some old custom or tradition? Does the phrase "in the name of the Lord" belong to the anointing or the praying — or both? V. 15: "And the prayer of faith shall save the sick" — are not these words strange? Is not an old custom indicated in these words? "And the Lord shall raise him up" — in other words, in praying for earthly things we need not prefix the words "if it be Thy will"? — "And if he have committed sins" — why that thought right here? "They shall be forgiven him," Luther has "vergeben sein." V. 16: "Pray one for another that ye may be healed" — of what?

This is what I have been able to gather by way of interpretation of v. 14 from several encyclopedias and a Bible dictionary: Palestine is said to be a very healthy country; sickness and disease are uncommon, not like in our country. Hence the few Scripture references to sickness.

And since sickness was not common, it came to be regarded as a direct punishment of God for some sin committed; see, e. g., Num. 12, 10; 2 Kings 5, 21; 2 Chron. 26, 20.

Hence, if the sickness of a person was regarded as a punishment of God due to some committed sin, recovery, according to the belief of the Jews, was speeded by repen-

tance and confession of sins. Hence—"let him call for the elders."

"Presbyterous" — in the Old Testament the priests, besides the regular clerical function, had also that of doctor, or physician, to some extent. This we see from several regulations in Leviticus and in other places, or passages. This is all the more possible since the art of healing was not, at least not apparently, highly developed in the Old Testament and not much more so in the New Testament. And here in the New Testament we have the presbyteroi perform the double function of priest and healer (doctor).

"Let them pray over him" — that the sick person would repent of his sins and confess them (since, according to their conception, sickness was a divine punishment for some sin committed), and then the Lord will have compassion on the sick person and forgive him his sins. The sins having been forgiven, the person will naturally recover.

"Having anointed him with oil" — this was done by the elders because of their double function. The oil was applied externally to allay the fever and to relieve the sick person of the fever's heat, even as we apply alcohol to the body for its cooling effect. At all events, the oil seems to have been a "medicine."

The verses at the end of James are obscure because we have no definite knowledge about church customs and about the treatment of disease then in vogue. The oil may have been a token of divine grace, or it may have been used as medicine. The commentaries contain curious references to the efficacy of olive-oil in massage treatment.

I do not believe that the popular notion concerning the cause of bodily ills has a bearing upon the interpretation. Do we not, even in our days, call the preaching elders, that is, the pastors, to pray with us when we are sick? And

does a conscientious pastor not in every case remember the spiritual ailments — sin and an evil conscience — when he is called to the bedside of a sick parishioner? The text in James refers to such pastoral treatment of the sick involving a return of health and prayer for forgiveness should both have their place. If this were the only text in the Bible on prayer, we could say that prayer will always "cure" a person. As a matter of fact we know that Christian prayer always involves "Thy will be done." The Apostle Paul was ailing physically all his life. On the other hand, while God does not promise to heal in every case, His blessing upon prayer is experienced by every Christian, especially by the sick.

12. INSPIRATION OF NON-APOSTOLIC WRITINGS.

I want to ask you to help me solve a difficulty. The difficulty concerns the divine authorship of the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke and the Acts. In order to be brief, I will present my difficulty in the form of a question: How were Theophilus and the first readers of the Gospel according to St. Mark to know that the books which they read were the inspired Word of God? Neither St. Luke nor St. Mark, as far as I can see, advance this claim. Neither of the two was one of the chosen twelve apostles through whom according to Matt. 10, 20 the Spirit of the Father should speak, whose word according to Matt. 10, 14, 15 every one must accept, and whose word according to John 17, 20; Eph. 2, 20, et al., is the foundation of our faith. In fact, their credentials are inferior to those of Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, and others who are expressly mentioned as coworkers of the apostles.

The testimony of the Church, which is generally quoted in favor of these men, to me seems to be practically worth-

less. For I believe that Prof. A. L. Graebner was right when he contended that Bibliology is an article of faith based on the Bible and nothing else. Cf. "Theological Quarterly," p. 130: "The propriety of this arrangement. . . . The testimony of the Church is neither more nor less in Bibliology than it is in Christology." In his further argument the sainted Professor made the statement that "the canonical books of the Old and the New Testament are . . . a fixed magnitude" (p. 133, last paragraph) and that everything that is said of any one part of it applies to every part. This does not satisfy me. This is indeed true of the Old Testament canon, which was a fixed magnitude in the days of Christ and His apostles and is quoted by them as such, John 10, 35 and 2 Tim. 3, 16. However, the New Testament canon is not so fixed and quoted in an inspired book of the Bible, but merely by the testimony of the Church, which is worthless in matters of faith and which, above all, is not even unanimous in this regard. I see no reason why the words of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 2, 13: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth" must be applied to the writings of St. Luke and St. Mark, who were not apostles like the Twelve or like St. Paul.

I have your inquiry of the 5th. Now, I am out here in the backwoods of Missouri, with not a work of reference at hand, just the English Bible. Hence I cannot verify or compare quotations from my sainted father's article in the *Theological Quarterly* (you fail to mention the volume, but I would be able to find that). But let me turn this matter over in my mind as fellows: —

As for the divine authorship of a New Testament writing, what evidence have you or I? Certainly 1 Cor. 2, 13 is a text in point, but it refers only to the testimony of Paul and his fellow-preachers, and of course *a fortiori*

would apply to his or their written communications. But there is no proof here of an inspiration of just those New Testament books, any of them, which we have. It proves a verbal inspiration of apostolic communications to the Church. Of this there can be no doubt. But the application of this text, *e. g.*, to Matthew's gospel, cannot be made without a certain hiatus in thought. As you say, the historical proof is not conclusive, though of course we distinguish canonicity and inspiration, the former being certainly involved with the testimony of the Church. It is in fact a historical concept while inspiration is a theological one. (By holding to this distinction, we understand Luther's mental attitude over against certain books, while he so strongly insisted on the inspiration of the Word of God in many other expressions of his.) As regards the inspiration of apostolic writings, the case is not so simple as you state. What we do know is that the apostles were to be the teachers of the Church to the end of time and that they brought their message by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, so that they were inerrant. But that does not mean that all they wrote was inspired; indeed, we know of certain writings that at least were not preserved for the post-apostolic age, as the Letter to the Loadiceans (which, however may have been one of the letters now in the New Testament canon) and the epistolary correspondence of which we have hints in Acts. Not the persons were inspired, but the writings, if we speak exactly. But which writings? I do not see that we have stronger proof (in some New Testament passage) for the divine authorship of John than for that of Luke. I see no reference to verbal inspiration of certain writings in Matt. 10. You interpret the verses correctly, but they do not prove that, *e. g.*, the Gospel according to St. Matthew is inspired. They would prove that only if Jesus had said that all their speaking

would be by words of the Holy Ghost, — and we know that this was far from being the case, even years after the resurrection. Hence you have no more proof for Matthew or John than for Mark and Luke. Rather, let me say — I am as certain of the inspiration of Mark and Luke as of that of Matthew and John.

How do I satisfy myself regarding this matter? Thus: 1) *A priori*: If we have the evidence of the Old Testament writings themselves, regardless of New Testament testimony, that they are divinely inspired, as we have; and when we find that our Lord corroborates this testimony (and we accept this because of our belief in the historicity of the record, which, again, is not the same as canonicity or inspiration); and when we realize that all this Old Testament record points to a more perfect, final, complete communication of God to the entire world; and when I find this in the New Testament, through our Lord's promise to the apostles and the operation of the Spirit on my heart, — then I have, not by logical deduction, but as a fact of which I am divinely convinced, the assurance of the divine authorship of those books which bring to me the apostolic message, the New Testament books. Understand, I here do not enter into the ramifications of the problem, canonicity etc.; I am simply telling you why I believe that the gospels, epistles, Acts, and Revelation are inspired. If the Old Testament canon, then certainly the New. I repeat that in saying this I accept the deity of Christ and the truthfulness of the gospel records which preserve His references to the Old Testament. But of this I am made sure by the same testimony of the Spirit which speaks to me of sin and grace, of the redemption and the spiritual life. I know that the Old Testament revelation is divinely inspired; I know that it foretells the consummation of all God's revelation in the future; I know that

this was fulfilled in Christ, who sent forth His messengers with an authority equal to His own; we have the writings that tell us about the salvation promised through ancient inspiration and the doctrines of the apostles. It is folly to reject these if I accept the Old Testament. Indeed, this difficulty is only intellectual; the heart requires no such proof. 2) *A posteriori*: The doctrines of Mark and Luke no less than those of John or Peter or Paul have power to change over the human soul, the greatest miracle in the created sphere. Texts from Luke and from Mark have caused sinners to become saints and martyrs for the faith. That any purely human production should work such results is unbelievable. In other words, it is much more reasonable to suppose that God inspired these books than that purely human authorship was able to produce such a literary miracle as St. Luke's gospel and one able to work miracles upon the human soul and life.

I am sitting out here on my porch overlooking the Big Piney and the hills on the other bank, and I cannot quote to you from books. What I have written may be contradicted by more than one volume from your shelves. It would not worry me a great deal, since my mind is fixed on these subjects. But I should be sorry to find myself in disagreement with the Fathers, whose judgment is so much more to be trusted than my own.

Well, here's the end of this chapter.

P. S. (1932). While reading proof on the above, I became curious as to what the fathers *did* say and spent an evening over Baier's *Compendium*, Gerhard, Pieper, and Hoenecke. Here is the result. Old Knoesius, quoted by Baier, says: "Even as God has impressed tokens of His essence on His other works, — from the sun to the most despised worm, — so that they are recognized as divine works and are so acknowledged through the bare sense of

that perfection which they possess, even so it is not unreasonable if we maintain that God wanted the book of His revelation to be recognized as such by comparison with any other." Once more: "Even as he who looks at the sun receives from him the impression of light through his own brightness, even so, from the sense of its divinity we recognize the divine origin of Scripture without any question." And on the next page Musaeus: "This internal testimony of the Holy Spirit asserts itself in the hearts of the reader through reading the Scripture in the vernacular, without any previous testimony of the Church." Baier himself cites as the principal evidence of the inspiration of any book of Scripture this testimony of the Holy Spirit, "so that its divine origin is impressed upon the reader and accepted by him." Regarding the further question of the testimony of the Church, Chemnitz has this: "The early Church in apostolic days was able to bear certain witness which Scriptures were divinely inspired. They knew the authors, whom God had commended to His Church through special evidences; they knew also which writings were from the hands of the apostles themselves and were able to judge from their oral tradition whether that which they read was really apostolic doctrine. Accordingly, the Scripture has canonical authority principally from the Holy Spirit, next from the writers themselves, and finally from the early Church as a witness to the inspiration of these writings." Quenstedt: "That the Letter to the Romans is St. Paul's we know on the testimony of the early Church; that it is sacred and canonical is known not on the testimony of the Church, but from its internal evidence." The same, again: "Who will deny that there is anything in the Scriptures except inspired books? That the Scriptures would not be corrupted and mutilated we are persuaded by divine providence and Christ's express promise, Matt. 5,

even if we did not have the testimony of the Church." Dr. Adolf Hoenecke, the Wisconsin Synod dogmatician, sums up the matter thus: "Accordingly we accept as canonical all books of the New Testament, not only because of the ecclesiastical witness to their authenticity, but because the Church has in all ages had the experience that from each of these books the Holy Spirit speaks." (*Dogmatic*, I, 422.) Finally, Pieper derives our certainty of a fixed canon of Scripture, "*dem keinerlei Unsicherheit anhaftet*," from such texts as John 8, 31. 32; 17, 20; Eph. 2, 20 — "since remaining in the doctrine of Christ and the apostles presupposes the certain possession of this doctrine."

IV. PROBLEMS IN ETHICS.

1. IS EVERY UNTRUTH A LIE?

The question lately arose in conference whether the following example should be used to show when one is justified in telling an untruth: A father wants to go somewhere, and his child wants to go along. The father, probably on account of the cold weather, cannot take his child with him, but the child insists on going with the father. In order to make the child willing to stay at home, he promises to bring it some candy if it will stay at home although he does not intend to do so, is not even going where there is candy. The conference was agreed that the example is not to the point. But where is the line between lies and defensible untruths?

Unless it can be shown beyond a doubt that an evasion in concealment of the truth or the statement of an untruth is under the circumstances clearly demanded by the law of love to the neighbor, it is to be adjudged, no matter how good the intention or how great the benefit, an immoral act and in the proper sense of the word a lie.

2. LIFE INSURANCE.

Why has our Synod changed its position on life insurance? It used to be considered sinful to take out these policies. To-day, while some still regard it as contrary to the Law of God, they do not exercise church discipline, and many would list life insurance among the adiaphora. As a matter of fact, insurance is very generally carried by our people. If we make concessions on this point, must we not also weaken on the lodge question and other principles of our church practise? The fathers of our Synod rejected

life insurance, and their reasons are valid to-day. How can we defend the associations which under the Lutheran name write policies exactly like those of the mutual or stock companies?

The Missouri Synod has changed its stand on life insurance. But that is chiefly because life insurance has changed. The policies of a generation ago generally partook of the form of a gamble. If the insured lived beyond a certain date, his policy expired, and all that he had paid in was lost. He — rather his heirs — could gain only if he died before a certain term had expired. But in recent years a great many new forms of life insurance have been brought forward, and many of these do not, in the manner described, partake of the nature of a gamble with human life. Concerning these I do not know of any expression of opinion in our church-papers or in our synodical reports. As for societies within the Synodical Conference, there are two, possibly more such, but they are built on the mutual plan and in effect combine the features of a *Sterbekasse* and a savings account. They would, however, classify as life insurance, but not of the type against which we had written twenty or thirty years ago. This type then did not exist in its present form, and I do not regard these policies as objectionable. There is, however, no synodical resolution of any kind on the subject. Hence I cannot subscribe to the statement that, while the Missouri Synod once rejected life insurance, it was on grounds that are still valid. So far as I know, — and Eckhardt's *Reallexikon* bears out my statement — we have never treated life insurance as a wrong for which members must be disciplined and, if necessary, excommunicated.

As for life insurance *per se*, it is true that the argument that "life insurance shows a lack of trust in God," while adduced by those who oppose life insurance, touches an

accidens and does not touch the essence of insurance. The same reasoning can apply to any form of investment and even to a bank account reserved for "a rainy day." On the other hand, your argument that by collecting \$5,000 after paying a premium of \$100 one profits at the loss of others does not seem to be justified. The premiums are so graded according to age (to the average length of life, as ascertained by the tables of mortality) that, assuming an honest management, all policy-holders will, in any event, receive the face value of their policy. They get what their contract calls for. As for the ethics of receiving \$5,000 after paying \$100, I know of a family that received \$650 for Calumet and Hecla copper shares that cost them 20 cents. Of course, the principle involved is not the same, since in the latter case there was a risk in making the original purchase, and in life insurance *no such risk is involved*. Hence morally it is better than investing in industrial stocks. There are other points of difference. But the *mere fact* that one receives, for no services rendered or any equivalent, a sum greater than the investment originally made, cannot be characterized as arguing an unethical, or sinful, transaction.

To my mind the issue is one that must be put up to the individual conscience. Often, far too often, covetousness is at the bottom of such transactions, covetousness on the part of the beneficiary and even, by a strange freak of human nature, of the one insured, who cannot personally benefit from the policy. The desire in such cases is to benefit disproportionately from the moneys paid as premiums. But that covetous desire, too, is *accidens* and is not necessarily involved in taking out insurance. Some feel that in no other way can they acquire habits of economy. Others believe that they "owe it to their family," even as they owe it to them that they have some money in

the savings-bank. And this may be found to be the motive also where there is no lack of faith in the loving providence of God. As I see it, we must preach trust in God, love of fellow-man, willingness to sacrifice for the kingdom of God, and, as a motive for all this, the love of God in Jesus Christ and depend on the power of the Gospel to neutralize the natural covetousness of the heart. The man who keeps on reinvesting all his funds for greater gains by buying bonds, lands, etc., is in the same condemnation with him who limits his ability to give for the spread of the Gospel and relief of suffering by taking out life insurance in such amounts as will inevitably produce such a result.

3. LIFE INSURANCE, LABOR UNIONS, PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL.

You ask "why our synodical periodicals do no more argue the Christian standpoint on life insurance, labor unions, professional baseball, and card-playing."

You remark that since adopting this resolution a brief article has appeared on card-playing in the *Lutheran Witness*. Supplemented by the item contained in the last issue, this should make clear our position on this subject.

I can see no call for discussing professional baseball. Things not distinctly forbidden in the Word of God call for no comment, unless some one raises the issue of right or wrong. I am not aware of any such discussion in the matter of baseball.

Labor Unions. We have never condemned labor unions as such, but whenever these organizations have adopted principles or employed methods contrary to God's Word, we were not slow to speak.

Life Insurance. We have never treated life insurance as a wrong for which members must be excommunicated.

Also the theses of Professor Bente in *Lehre und Wehre*, Volume 54, do not demand that our congregations proceed with church discipline against those who carry insurance.

Personally I am very much averse to uttering any warnings unless one has a clear word of God to stand on. I know that the question has been asked: "Since we no longer oppose life insurance, will we not be forced to accept the lodge, too?" Both premise and conclusion are false. Do not overlook the fact that we have never treated these two as on the same basis. The antichristian lodge is condemned by the First and Second commandments, by every text that teaches the Holy Trinity and the Christian way of salvation, and specifically by 2 John 9, 1 Cor. 10, 21, and 2 Cor. 6, 14 ff. Our judgment regarding the lodge is not derived by way of inference, but by direct demonstration, even though the lodge is not mentioned by name, as little as the Roman Catholic Church. Your letter does not touch this point, but I thought it well to mention it because this generally is a conclusion drawn from any discussion "of our past and present stand."

4. A SCHOOL PICNIC ON SUNDAY MORNING.

At a recent meeting of our congregation (at which I was not present) it was decided without any opposition that the annual children's school picnic should be held on Sunday, June 1, in a local city park and regular church services were to be abolished on that day, except that we have an informal service of some sort out there in the morning.

Since then I have taken a decided stand against this for various reasons. It does not seem right that such a procedure take place. What advice can you give?

The practise of omitting regular church services on Sunday morning in order to celebrate a school picnic is

something new in our Synod and would not, I think, receive anything but condemnation if brought to the knowledge of our people generally. It is true that no specific command of God is transgressed by the arrangement as described in your letter, but the offense given to outsiders and to many of our own people should be considered. You say, however, that there is to be "an informal service of some sort" in connection with the picnic. If this service were given with Scripture-reading, prayers, hymns, sermon, etc., somewhat like usually, the offense would be removed, since it is not improper for a congregation to meet for worship outdoors occasionally.

5. SUNDAY WORK.

In these times of depression, when a man is out of work, is it permissible for him to accept a position which requires him to work on Sundays, thus not being in a position to go to church? It is understood of course that in that case he keep up his home worship, reading of the Bible, etc.

This question is one not so easily answered. To say that a man may engage in labor which regularly prevents his attendance at divine worship is apt to be misused. Yet one cannot discipline those who are unable to secure other work than such as you describe. So long as our Church upholds the liberty of the Christian Church with regard to holy-days it cannot compel attendance as an absolute sign of faith. It is different when the person absents himself from services without good reason. I believe that a person may engage in occupations which limit his church-going to rare occasions or Sunday nights and still remain in a state of grace. The Scripture-proof for this is Rom. 14, 6, which places the observance of certain days among the things indifferent. This, of course, does not say that preaching and the Word of God are matters of indifference.

6. CHARITY AND INSPECTOR'S JOB.

One of my members has been offered a position as inspector on the trolley-cars, his duty being somewhat that of a detective watching conductors and motormen, reporting their delinquencies in duty, effecting perhaps their ultimate discharge. He asks whether the principle of love does not demand that I tell my neighbor his delinquency first, then take sterner measures if it does not help. That a company does not use such tactics is plain. On the other hand, that is about the only way a company has of preserving discipline. A direct method would defeat its own end. But should not the principle of charity also in this position rule the Christian's conduct?

In reply to your question let me ask you another: What difference would you make between the inspector on a street-car and the inspector of woolen goods in a textile mill? Certainly inspectors who check up on faulty product are apt to cause the discharge of a workman. Is it their business first to warn the workman? They cannot, as a matter of fact, do so without betraying the trust of their employers, who absolutely depend upon reports of all shortcomings for their honest dealing with the retailer.

The street-car company does not sell products, but service. That service must be inspected, and the personal factor is unavoidable. The conductors, etc., are not the only ones entitled to our charity; those who are trying to serve the public with the trolley-system have the same right. Besides, the faithful workman has a right to be recognized, which is impossible without proper supervision.

7. A RAFFLE.

Is it in keeping with our Lutheran Church practise if the Walther League has an ice-cream social and sells ice-cream at a given price per dish and with each dish gives

a number on it for the purpose of giving the person holding the lucky number a quilt?

The practise which you describe is a type of raffle and should not be introduced into our endeavors for receiving funds.

8. MASKING AT PARTIES.

May I have your opinion on masking at a Hallowe'en party of a Walther League or some other Lutheran young people's society? Can you cite Scripture or give me some other argument against masking at such parties?

I am unable to cite Scripture against masking at parties. Nor can I point to any definite evil results that to my knowledge have arisen out of parties which had this feature. However, anything that artificially breaks down the natural reserve, as is certainly done when those who are at play do not know one another's identity, must be considered questionable. At the same time I would not say that such mask affairs are to be absolutely condemned. I can imagine parties of this nature where the group is small and where there is supervision by sensible adults, at which for a matter of fifteen or thirty minutes the young people wear masks while playing their games. I cannot see that any harm can come from this feature under such limitations. But it is safer to eliminate this feature altogether.

9. BOBBED HAIR.

From the Christian point of view, is it right for a woman to have her hair bobbed? I am thinking of 1 Cor. 11, 4—16. Do these verses condemn the custom of wearing bobbed hair?

The text from First Corinthians must not be considered a prohibition of bobbed hair, but refers to the deportment of women in public. That which was a disgrace then be-

cause it brought a woman under suspicion of being loose in morals is not a disgrace to-day.

V. 14 says indeed that it is the natural thing for men to wear their hair short and for women to wear it long. But v. 16 the apostle expressly disclaims any purpose of making this a law. For a discussion of this text you may consult *Der Lutheraner*, 1926, p. 124.

10. JEWELRY AND COSMETICS.

I have been requested to give an address on worldliness and in that connection want to touch upon personal adornment, especially of our young women. Please give me some hint as to the right attitude for our Christian youth to take towards jewelry and cosmetics.

In reply to your question let me say that in my opinion the use of jewelry and cosmetics should not be made a matter of conscience. These are matters which belong in the field of Christian liberty and come under the general rule that we may use the things of this world, but not abuse them. The sinfulness may be in purpose, but who is going to sit in judgment on that?

11. HYPNOTISM.

Among the stunts provided for your men's club is a hypnotist who will cast spells on the members and make them go through antics which will create, it is assumed, a great deal of merriment. I think your misgivings about this "stunt" are well founded. Hypnotism is not a thing that should be treated as a source of innocent amusement. I remember a hypnotic demonstration which was given quite a number of years ago during a synodical session of the M. District. We were gathered in the evening for relaxation in a large room on the second floor of the parish-school. We sat around the edge of the room, and when

we had lit our cigars and corn cobs, a gentleman was introduced who would now entertain us with a performance of a scientific nature — he would hypnotize any member of the gathering and show the remarkable phenomena of the trance-state. Some one volunteered as subject for the demonstration, and we thought it very laughable when he gathered flowers from the floor, sawed wood, killed a chicken, picked caterpillars from his sleeve, quite unconscious of the capers he was cutting under the hypnotist's direction. After a few minutes of this the hypnotist tried to call his subject out of the trance-state. When his first attempts failed, we could see the perspiration stand out in beads on his brow and his face assume an ashen hue as he continued, in a very panic of fear, to use the means that ordinarily prove effective in rousing the sleeper. By this time the entire gathering was in a state of terror, and the excitement became almost unbearable as we watched the maddening efforts of the hypnotist, who finally shouted in a hoarse voice, "You are not sleeping! You are not sleeping! You are awake, *awake*, **AWAKE!**" Finally, when the suspense had become quite intolerable, the subject awoke. The hypnotist was close to a state of collapse when it was over.

Hypnotists' subjects have been known to pass from their trance or coma into death. Some years ago a professional performer was demonstrating on a New Jersey stage. His subject was a young man. His efforts to bring consciousness back failed, physicians were called, and the boy was finally taken to a hospital, where after further efforts of reanimation he was declared dead. Death was caused by a rupture of the aorta (main artery). A number of such cases are now on record, and they should prove a warning not to toy with a mysterious power, as yet imperfectly known and dangerous even in the hands of an expert.

12. A CASE OF INCEST.

In my city there are a man and a wife who have been legally married. He divorced his first wife in Germany because she refused to come over with him and decided to stay with another man. His present wife divorced her husband because he was a drunkard and treated her shamefully. Her former husband was the son of her present husband. They have been attending services fairly regularly, and I gave them Communion until I found out about the conditions just mentioned. His daughter spread the rumor about the peculiar relations, and in this way others in the congregation found out about the case. He himself gave me the above definite information.

In reply to your question regarding a man divorced from his former wife and now married to the wife divorced from his son, I hold that the case is one of incest and that the quotations Lev. 18, 15; 20, 12; 1 Cor. 5, 1 apply. If either party in the present union were the guilty party in their respective divorces, or if either of these divorces was obtained on insufficient grounds, there would, of course, be an additional reason for regarding the union as sinful and for making separation and repentance the condition of church-membership. The least that can be done is to advise separation *a thoro et mensa*. See also Walther's *Pastorale*, p. 211.

For my own information please inform me whether the laws of your State recognize as a valid marriage such a union as you describe. The questions regarding support of the woman and care of the children is one which the congregation must certainly concern itself with and which must be decided according to the principles of equity and Christian charity.

13. "LOOKING UPON A WOMAN."

One of my members comes to me with a question about Matt. 5, 28: "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." His difficulty is that Jesus here appears to pass judgment upon any impulse of sex, while on the other hand we teach that He has instituted matrimony. It seems, then, that Jesus asks us to eradicate that which otherwise He has told us to regulate and control. What is the right interpretation of that verse?

The thought expressed by your member is not new. It has been urged by ascetics, even in the early history of the Church. It is the central idea of Tolstoy's *Kreutzer-sonate*. However, it is an interpretation not only at variance with the teaching of the epistles, — and let us not forget that Jesus through His apostles intends to continue the teaching office of His earthly days, — but disagrees also with the teachings of Christ Himself. In the verses which soon follow Jesus recognizes the state of matrimony, hence also the sexual relations involved. Now, as for verse 28, we cannot overlook the fact that in the entire passage, Jesus emphasizes the spiritual nature of the Law of God, which the Jews had understood to apply only to outward acts, like in this case to adultery. In reproof of this error, Jesus says that "even to look at a woman," etc. Surely our Lord would not say anything by which He would condemn the institution of matrimony which He Himself instituted in Paradise. Nor can we make an application of this text which would construe it as a sentence of condemnation on sexual desire as such. That is the degrading position of ascetics both in the Catholic Church and in Protestant connections. That which we are commanded to control and to regulate is not in itself sinful, but, to quote Martin Luther, is a natural appetite like that for food and drink.

14. SEX EDUCATION.

I'm against it.

Let me explain.

I am against lecturing upon the problem of sex to young people. I am altogether for permitting the sex relation to be treated as a mystery until life itself imparts its instruction on this subject.

You have recently had a few "sad cases," which lead you to believe that, after all, we are neglecting a duty with reference to this subject. There should be "more warning and more adequate instruction in sexual matters."

Who has not in the course of his ministry witnessed such "sad cases"? They will occur to the end of time. As long as Christian young people will slacken in their watchfulness over their lustful and deceitful heart, there will be scandal, shame, ruined lives. Parents will wring their hands and ask, "How could you do it?" All the education in matters of sex that the physiologist and psychologist can impart will not change the result. A knowledge of physiology does not purify the heart. And I am entirely looking aside here from the type of "sex hygiene" which does Satan's own work by teaching young people how to escape the consequences of illicit intercourse. I fear that this kind of sexual education is not rare in our own circles. The number of illegitimate births has become alarmingly small.

But why not give the boys and girls a course in genetics based on simple scientific data, so that they may enter into the relations of adult life with open eyes and, as you say, "avoid the pitfalls of ignorance"?

If you refer to ignorance regarding the facts of procreation, I wonder how much you know about our young people. As a matter of fact — and I am speaking about pure, decent young people — they know everything. Nothing appears to me so ridiculous as the writing and printing

of books for the enlightenment of the young man and the young woman regarding things that are no mysteries to the child of twelve.

But the point urged by the sponsors of sex education through the means of scientifically trained teachers is this — let our children get their knowledge about reproduction from respectable persons and in a manner that does not reflect on marriage. Too often they are told about such matters by evil companions.

Now, I am not going to deny that there is feasible a scientific discussion of sexual matters, anatomy, physiology, genetics, the mechanics of reproduction, and the hygiene of the bodily parts involved. Unquestionably. University classes in medicine leave none of these things unexplored, and the teacher, text-book, chart, blackboard, and dissecting-room are made to work together that these organs and processes may be understood. Such instruction may be, and doubtless often is, as far from salaciousness and obscenity as the study of respiration or circulation. How can this be? Simply because the mind is not directed to these matters of sex *as such*, but for the purpose of a course in training men and women in the diagnosis and treatment of disease and in the nursing of the sick. If ever Aristotle's principle that the purpose is the essence of a thing appears in full force, it is here. But center the attention on sexual matters as such, and the unlawful desire that slumbers in all of us is awakened. Those who tell us that this subject can for its own sake be treated with the same freedom from any necessary emotions of a voluptuous nature as other facts of natural history simply ignore a basic fact in our human make-up after the Fall.

I do not here contradict what I wrote you some months ago about the inherently non-moral character of the sexual function. God implanted the sexual impulse into man and woman when He created them, and all that He created

was good. He made man so that he needs food and drink and gave him a digestive system. He gave him lungs for breathing. And He gave him organs of generation. Through the Fall all man's natural functions and impulses have become corrupt. But all these functions and appetites have a proper use when they are not perverted from the purpose for which God implanted them. They have not become evil *per se*. But that is not the same as saying that the subject of sex can be safely handled as a course of instruction. Not even the most exquisite delicacy can neutralize the stimulating effect inescapably connected with the act of concentrating the mind on this topic. There exists under normal conditions a sense of shame and modesty which is broken down by familiarity with these matters, especially in the case of immature minds, which have not yet acquired the protective power of self-government. For proof I need only point to the fact that the vogue of reckless publicity in speech and literature concerning the relations of man and woman has in all ages been accompanied by gross sexual license. To-day we see in the rising tide of juvenile delinquency the effect of the sex drama, the sex movie, the sex novel and magazine, and the sex tabloid newspaper.

I consider the various handbooks and guides for the instruction in sexual matters as worse than useless. Possibly there are texts which in an inoffensive manner build up in the mind of the child at the threshold of puberty an approach to mature sexual life; I know of none that would meet this description. But I know half a dozen texts, written by clergymen and physicians, which, written with the best intentions, must tend to create the very condition which they seek to correct. "True modesty," some one has said, "lies in the entire absence of thought upon the subject." If you substitute "attention" for "thought," the sentence is correct.

There is a source of sexual instruction which lies ready at hand and which never fails—I mean the Bible. The Bible-reading child finds both in the Old and in the New Testament all the necessary facts of human genetics, from conception to birth, and he will also discover that the way of the transgressor is hard. Moreover, the Bible, while frank, is never salacious, but possesses also in its statements regarding these matters a divine quality. Its unique and lofty purity reflects the divine Spirit that has wrought in its authors. It does more than instruct. It endows, through the same Spirit, the believing reader with an aversion to impurity, instills in him a holy fear of offending against God's Law, enlivens his conscience so that it senses danger afar off, and arms him with the weapon of prayer for the hour of temptation.

Finally we have in Luther's explanation of the Sixth Commandment the sum and substance of ethical teaching on this point. It would take me beyond the confines of this letter to remind you of the proper and most effective mode of bringing this commandment in school and confirmation class to bear upon the consciences of our children. In some of our congregations the pastor requests a Lutheran physician to address the boys and girls (separately, of course) on certain hygienic aspects of personal purity. As I do not know whether there are data or testimonials regarding the value of such talks, I am unable to advise. On one thing I can make no concession: unless supported and reenforced through and through with the appeal to the regenerate nature, to the motives of the fear and love of God, all sexual instruction tends to profane, degrade, and contaminate rather than to uplift and purify. There is only one argument that is effective in the presence of temptation, and that is the argument of Paul in 1 Cor. 6, 15—20.

V. CONGREGATIONAL LIFE.

1. WOMAN'S PLACE IN THE CONGREGATION.

Is there any objection to permitting women to attend congregational meetings for the purpose of taking part in the discussions and voting? I have in mind only such women whose husbands are not members. Some of these women feel that there ought to be "no taxation without representation," not even in a church.

I do not think that women should take part in the discussions of the voters' meetings or vote in the concerns of the congregation. Where there are too few men to conduct the business of a congregation, one would be compelled by necessity to give the women some right in the administration. Otherwise I can conceive of no reason for departure from our time-honored custom. It is not true that the women of our churches have "taxation without representation." They are represented by their husbands and by the men generally, through whom they can bring their wishes to the attention of the congregation. Our women have never complained that their wishes counted for nothing when a ladies' aid society, for instance, would pass some resolutions calling upon the voters' meeting to take certain action. Indeed, I have never known a case in which such requests were not favorably acted upon. In matters which concern the women primarily, joint meals at conferences, the restaurant at the school picnic, etc., the voters, as a rule, give the women free hand. You know, of course, that the woman has the right of veto in the calling of pastors or teachers when a candidate

does not possess the qualifications mentioned in Scripture. Certainly 1 Cor. 14, 34. 35 and 1 Tim. 2, 11. 12 plainly indicate the place of women in the Christian congregation. A paper by Rev. P. Lindemann in the *Theological Quarterly* of 1920 treats this subject more fully.

2. VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Your request for an opinion on woman's suffrage in the State is at hand. A telegram received last week seems to indicate that there is some dissension in the conference on this question. The *Lutheran Witness*, in 1919, contained an article in which this whole matter was treated. The writer was Rev. S., and his paper was printed by resolution of the St. Louis Pastors' and Teachers' Conference as expressing their convictions. Its salient sentence is p. 179: "Since it [the suffrage] is something which God neither forbids nor commands, it is a Christian woman's liberty to vote or not to vote." As I am not acquainted with the arguments [against the suffrage of women] urged by the brethren who dissent, I am unable to answer them. I should make a distinction between women in politics and the right of women to use the ballot. The right approach to this question is from a consideration of the general doctrine of Scripture concerning woman and from the blessings which womanhood has received through the Gospel, especially the elevation of woman wherever the Gospel has been accepted, whereas in heathen lands she is fearfully oppressed. Her relation to her husband — a helper, who shall acknowledge him as head. Her sphere — the home, the family. Political activity takes her out of both. The use of the ballot does not. Some of the brethren believe that, as woman exercises a kind of lordship over the man by voting in an election, she is committing a moral wrong. The argument seems to me to be far-fetched. Man has

given her the ballot. I believe with the sainted Dr. Succop of Chicago that woman may vote, shall vote, but keep out of the sphere of political life. You may compare the passages 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2. I can find nothing here that will forbid a woman to vote at an election. All politics, in the last analysis, is concerned with taxes. In this women have an immediate interest, even if they are not themselves in business and own no property.

There are many sins against which we must warn. Let us not make more sins than there are. Above all, let us not leave the consciences in doubt unless it is a matter in which we are ready to excommunicate those who act according to a conviction which we possibly cannot share. Either institute proceedings of church discipline or leave the matter alone. And I would certainly not say "Thou shalt not" unless I can quote Scripture. In the case of the lodge every text which teaches salvation by grace and every prohibition of idolatry speaks out in clarion tones against lodge worship and doctrine. I mention this because I have heard the lodge referred to as a parallel case. It is not at all parallel. In the articles printed in the *Lutheran Witness* the movement for woman's suffrage was properly characterized, and where its sponsors have spoken wildly and wickedly, the article quotes Scripture against them, stating that no Christian can associate himself with such company as the Feminists are, but will vigorously oppose them. But when the right of vote is granted, the unrighteous means and purposes involved in the Feminist movement no longer enter into the equation. Even if we know that in the end woman will not be benefited, but harmed, by the right of suffrage, we need not for such reason forbid our women to vote. The thing is done, women now have the right, and I believe that the St. Louis Joint Conference is right in saying, Now let them vote.

3. A LADY PRESIDENT OF THE Y. P. S.

Is it permissible for a young lady in good standing in the congregation to hold the office of president in the young people's society, provided she does not lead devotion (that being done by the pastor or teacher) or any other office, e. g., vice-president, secretary, or treasurer?

Under the limitation mentioned, I do not see why a young lady should not perform the functions of a chairman, secretary, or treasurer in a society of young people.

4. A WOMAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT.

When I arrived here in C., I found that my Sunday-school superintendent was a lady and, I must say, a very good worker, too. In your chapter on "The Sunday-school Superintendent" I find that throughout you refer to the one in charge as a male person. There is no objection in having a lady superintendent, is there? I should prefer to have a man take charge, but the women by far outnumber the men. — Another thing I should like to ask is this: Does the Sunday-school department have to ask the congregation or the voting members for permission for everything that it does? For instance, if the Sunday-school should order some Christmas-cards for the children to sell, is it necessary to ask permission of the congregation? I should think not.

I do not think that women should be barred from the office of Sunday-school superintendent so long as that office does not imply teaching men. This would be the case if she taught an adult Bible class, as is often done by superintendents, or if she instructed the male teachers in their duties, etc. As for the authority of the congregation over the Sunday-school department, I do not believe that it

should operate in such a way as to destroy all initiative on the part of the workers. If the congregation holds you responsible for such details as you mention, that ought to be sufficient.

5. OVERORGANIZED?

I am tempted to agree with you that the pastor whose parish letter you have sent me is inviting nervous collapse and a premature old age. He certainly lists a medley of organizations. He has a "Lutheran Guild," an organization of young women who "furnish flowers and money for special occasions." Then there are two choirs, one referred to in the parish-paper as the "regular one"; the other one is an irregular one, I presume (most choirs are irregular). Both of them are fully organized. The "Ladies' Mite Society" is next. They "look after the church-cleaning" and have remodeled the interior of the parsonage. Furthermore there is the "Lutheran Circle," composed of young ladies, "most of whom are still in high school." They "are at present financing the church music." Also: "The Missionary Society," composed of twenty-seven women. "The Olympia Club" is composed of young men of the Sunday-school. They distribute the parish-paper and "are willing to make themselves useful in other ways." December 16 the "Lutheran Men" were organized. A constitution of fourteen articles will regulate their activities, and there is a president, a vice-president, a secretary, a treasurer, a chief usher, and a chaplain. The Sunday-school teaching staff has elected a superintendent, an assistant superintendent, a secretary, an assistant secretary, a treasurer, a pianist, two librarians, and two assistant librarians. The church board consists of deacons, elders, trustees, and various other officers.

Now, while it seems difficult to believe that local con-

ditions should make such a multiplication of bodies within the church necessary, I am not yet ready to admit that a high degree of organization necessarily means over-organization. Where a church has not a proper foundation, laid securely in Christian instruction, such organizations are, of course, mainly an attempt to prop the structure with a system of stilts and braces, which, in addition, have a habit of coming down and burying the minister in the wreckage. But assume that the foundation is properly laid, that the church has a number of good lay leaders, who can take some responsibility off the shoulders of the minister, and I cannot see any objection to a fully organized church. Let two questions be asked, and as you answer them, you have either approved or disapproved of organizations in a given case: Does each of these organizations without mutual interference contribute something in the way of interest or support to the work of the church locally and at large? Are they an outgrowth of the spirit of stewardship, or do they attempt to supply a substitute for the teaching of the Gospel?

6. THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIETY.

I have looked over the declaration of principles for the conduct of young people's societies which you clip from the *Lutheran Standard*.

On several points there may be a divergence of opinion.

First, as concerns the section "Membership," it might be urged that a society which regards as members "all confirmed, unmarried young people of the congregation," etc., is lacking in an important element, *viz.*, organization.

By the scheme here proposed the pastor, it appears to us, takes too prominent a part in the work of the society. He not only meets with the young people, but is supposed to conduct the meetings as chairman. He must approve

of expenditures not submitted to the congregation for consent. I have heard of the other extreme — societies that ignore the pastor and resent every attempt of his to guide them in their activities as unwarranted intrusion and interference; churches within the church, which form a clique that wants a great many privileges not granted to those outside their select circle and recognizes no duties toward congregation and minister. If there is a choice between these extremes, then I say, by all means give the pastor the leadership in the society's affairs, as here proposed, rather than relegate him to the station of "rank outsider." But there is a golden mean. Let the young people manage their own affairs, elect their own presiding officers, and exercise the functions of an organization possessing specific rights and duties; but let there be hearty and cheerful cooperation with the pastor, frequent discussion with him of the society's activities, seeking of his advice, and constant recognition of his authority in all things relating to conduct and life, as their spiritual adviser. No program should be given that has not first received his sanction as to every detail. Wherever the pastor's right to reject any song, reading, or play that appears to him objectionable in any way is not recognized, the society is on the wrong track, having established an "independence" which is detrimental to its own best interests.

Give your young people the liberty of managing their own business, but let such liberty not degenerate into license. Since you are as pastor responsible to the congregation and to God for the activities of your young people, the tendency of their work, the spirit of their meetings, you must also be granted the privilege of "taking a hand" in the society's affairs whenever circumstances arise that affect the spiritual welfare of its members and of the congregation.

As to making "the young people's treasury subject to the wishes of the congregation," I venture the opinion that better results may be expected where the society has the right to expend its funds as it sees fit. When a program or entertainment has been laboriously worked up and the reward has come in the shape of, let us say, \$50 surplus in the treasury, it would look to me like a refined species of cruelty if the congregation at its next meeting would call upon the Y. P. S. treasurer to disgorge the \$45 needed for building the minister a hen-house. The purpose may be worthy enough, but the young people would be more enthusiastic about the donation if it were extracted from them by a method more gentle than the one here proposed. If the society is otherwise properly managed, there will be no tendency to use its income for selfish ends.

7. BAZAARS.

In reply to your welcome letter I wish to say that I do not ignore the spirit of sacrifice when our good ladies prepare their articles for the sales. In my opinion, however, it is a disgrace for the Church of the Savior to sell these articles under the auspices of His Church. Let us take an illustration out of life. Suppose a family which is well able to support itself by the labor of the hands or whatever labor it might be. It is a respectable family of the city or country. This family announces a sale of articles which they have made during spare time. They would invite the neighbors and friends to the sale and also to a supper, for which they must pay. What would the neighbors and friends think of such a sale and supper? What impression would this make upon the general public? The Church is a large family, composed of professing Christians, believers in Christ and the living God. The love to God is strong enough to compel them to give all that is needed to support

their Church. But now these faithful members prepare articles for a sale, a public church sale. The daily paper announces the sale at the church. Everybody is welcome to come and buy. What must the world think of that Christian congregation? Surely such a congregation does not exert a wholesome influence upon the outsiders. They would think of that church as they would of that family.

I also maintain that offense is given to the world by these church sales. I cannot believe that the people buy in the same spirit at these sales as in the open market. They go and buy to help the poor church. With this intention they attend the sale. In reality they are not helping the church, but only themselves. We ought not to give the outsiders an opportunity to help the church. That ought to, as it in fact is, remain a Christian privilege. Is it right to strengthen these people in their belief that they are doing something for the church? I still believe that a public church sale is a disgrace to the Christian church. It is a sign of weak faith and little love to the Savior. Our good ladies should be busy and work. The fruit of their labor could be disposed of in the same manner as is done for other purposes, for instance, for their own household.

Your position seems to be that you do not favor the church sales, but do not wish to ignore the spirit of sacrifice revealed by them. Let us keep the spirit of sacrifice and abolish the public sale of the Christian congregation.

I can go with you the full length of your letter or with any one having a similar opinion regarding church fairs and suppers, so long as they do not demand that every sale or supper should be regarded as a sin. Sentiment in our Synod is opposed to bazaars, etc. But sentiment in our Synod hitherto has not gone the length of condemning such undertakings as sinful. Yet this is precisely what some are now ready to do. I believe that separatism is as

great a danger for our Synod as unionism. People are ready to split the Synod on questions only settled by a chain of deductions from Scripture-texts and only remotely related to Christian doctrine. This attitude breeds radicalism. As editors we have the duty to strike the balance between both unwarranted extremes.

I know that in St. Louis, people (outsiders) come to our church suppers, not because they want to help the church, but because they get a dollar meal for fifty cents. But why should the women not give the proceeds in cash? Because they do not want to be forever giving out of their husbands' pants pockets. I know rich women who will sew or do fancy-work or make quilts because they take delight in doing something with their hands for the church rather than simply write checks on the first of each month.

On the whole, and as generally conducted, sales and suppers are, as you call them, a disgrace for the church. But they are not necessarily so and not everywhere.

I thank you very much for going into this question so thoroughly. My personal influence will always be against congregational methods which make the church a house of merchandise, though not absolutely in the sense of John 2, 16.

8. THE BAND IS INVITED TO A METHODIST PICNIC.

1. It would be difficult to prove that your band, in playing at picnics of sectarian or Catholic churches, is giving aid to false doctrine. The texts quoted do not refer to fraternal outward activities, such as contributing musical numbers to a picnic. The same argument would apply to those who sell food and drink for such a gathering.

2. I believe that the sense of fitness, good taste, propriety, can be urged against the acceptance of such invita-

tions. If I were pastor, I would not conceal my distaste for such participation, even though it involved no denial of Lutheran doctrine. For this reason, if strife should be created in your congregation by such activity of the band, Rom. 14 would require that it refrain from it.

3. One might also urge that testimony against the false doctrine of these churches is weakened by such activities of the band. At least the impression of indifferentism is created in the minds of some.

4. While I may urge such points as 2 and 3, I would not consider myself in duty bound to protest or make of it a case of church discipline, for the reason stated. A minister has a right to voice disapproval even when he is not ready to call certain things a sin or to treat those who offend as if they were sinners and publicans.

9. NAMING A CEMETERY.

My congregation has recently procured ground for a cemetery. We are in quest of the best and most suitable name for a church cemetery. The names commonly used here are "Sunnyside," "Brush Creek," "High Point," and the like. This sounds too much like naming a farm or park.

We should like to have a name that puts the stamp of consecration on the place. The only Biblical name I can think of is "Machpelah"; but I have never known of any cemetery named thus.

I would not choose the name Machpelah for a cemetery, because 1) the word is hard to pronounce, 2) it would have to be explained to all strangers, and 3) they might then imagine it to be a Jewish burial-ground. Our cemeteries are generally named after the congregation which owns or has started it. "Concordia" has been used for cemeteries owned by several congregations. It would be suitable elsewhere.

10. CONGREGATIONAL OFFICES.

Our congregation has elected a committee of three (of which I am one) to revise our constitution and by-laws. We have had a number of meetings. So far we have not drafted a paragraph. This is not due to the fact that we have not been working, for our meetings last to eleven o'clock and later. We are "working our way into the situation." (The proper procedure according to the Gestalt psychology!) We have been reading aloud and discussing your book "Handbook for Congregational Officers." We find it very helpful indeed because it contains rather definite suggestions. That has been the trouble with our constitution and by-laws — they were too general. We intend to make the constitution simple and general, as you suggest, but the by-laws are to be explicit. We have almost finished reading your book and are about ready to draft our document. That is why I am writing to you. I want to let you know that your book has helped us and to ask a few questions.

To-day I received and read "The Vestryman" of Calvin P. Swank's (U. L. C.). Have you seen it? I think it is too indefinite. But he has a few good things in it. I like his attitude toward stewardship and the place of money in the business of the church, also his distinction between publicity and advertising. He provoked a few questions in my mind concerning which I'd like to have your opinion.

1. He says: "In highly developed city churches it is recommended by the United Lutheran Church that there be but one classification, known as deacons. This makes it possible to elect the best men of the congregation irrespective of their abilities. Also to organize the vestry into committees for a larger service. . . ." Do you think this plan wise — just electing a number of deacons and letting them elect committees (trustees, treasurers, etc.)?

2. He urges a number of reasons for the choice of the term "vestry" instead of "council." I notice that you use the two interchangeably. Which do you consider preferable?

3. Do you think it wise to have the elders serve as a nominating committee? It means recommending their own successors.

4. Would you recommend inserting a clause making the pastor *ex officio* a member of all committees?

5. We have found that our annual meeting (in January) is usually a long one because we have annual reports at that meeting. The election of officers also takes place at this meeting and is the last thing on the order of business. That means that everybody is anxious to hurry up and get over with it. We have been considering recommending a special meeting in December (we have quarterly meetings) for the purpose of election and reading the constitution and by-laws in connection therewith. Have you heard of any congregations that have this arrangement, and do you know how it is working out? The new officers will then assume office on January 1.

6. A point of interest. Swank: "A vestryman is not 'in office' until he is installed." Graebner: "They [the vestrymen] require, as little as the ministry, an installation in order to make their transactions valid." G. preferred.

7. Do you consider it advisable to insert a clause declaring members who have not attended voters' meetings for, say, two years as no longer on the list of voters? This sometimes is important in establishing a quorum.

Let me answer your questions in the order contained in your letter.

1. It seems to me that all important officers should be elected directly by the congregation.

2. "Vestry" in recent usage is exactly the German

Vorstand. The vestry plus trustees, school board, treasurer, etc., are the council. In many of our congregations the term vestry is used for the church council.

3. Elders should certainly not serve as a nominating committee. If they have good candidates, they have the right to nominate them from the floor.

4. I think a clause making the pastor an *ex-officio* member of all committees should be inserted.

5. I do not know of any such.

6. If the congregation has decided that vestrymen take their office through installation, that settles the matter. Otherwise, the civil law provides that trustees, etc., are in office when elected or after a certain specified date.

7. I would not favor such a clause, since such elimination of the name would readily be understood as excommunication.

11. THE LANGUAGE QUESTION.

We have a few families here the heads of which are voting members, and they desire equal rights for English. But they are, as it appears, in the minority. The leaders of the German families point to the constitution and say they cannot rightly demand what they do as it is unconstitutional.

I am sure that the minority asking for regular English services have a right to make such a request. However, they cannot ask "equal rights for English," but a number of services, somewhat in proportion to the demand for English work. Other questions enter in. Is there a missionary opportunity through the regular use of English? If there is, try to convince your people. If you cannot convince them, you have done your duty and rather than disturb the work abide by their decision. *Man kann solche Sachen nicht uebers Knie abbrechen.*

12. RESIGNING FROM THE CONGREGATION.

Is there such a thing as resigning from a Christian congregation as one resigns from any other society?

1. Yes. But if one resigns from the congregation, one resigns from the Lutheran church. If the Church is the body of Christ, none of its members can separate and say that he is still united with Christ, Eph. 5, 23; Rom. 12, 5.

2. To refuse to attend the Lord's Supper and to support the church is the same thing as resigning from the church if it is clear that admonition is refused.

13. RESIGNING FROM VOTING MEMBERSHIP.

One of my members desires to discontinue his voting membership while retaining his standing as a communicant. Should or can my congregation accept this resignation?

There is something puzzling about the idea of resigning from voting membership; but since we do not compel people to join, there is no reason why we should compel them to remain. I can even imagine cases where a congregation would accept such a resignation with enthusiasm. I once had a man apply for membership who came with a release from another congregation, but who requested me to receive him as a communicant only as he had such a terrible temper he would make trouble in congregational meetings. I fully approved of his stand, and everybody was (or remained) happy. If a man finds that he is more of a detriment than a help to a congregation, why should he not resign from voting membership? Of course, that reason should be clearly understood by all.

14. A CASE OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

1. If the steps of Matt. 18 have been followed in love and spirit, an excommunicated person is a heathen and a publican.

Now, must 1 Cor. 5, 13 under all circumstances and at all times be understood that excommunicated persons are not permitted to be in a congregational or business meeting? Self-evident that they are silent, do not participate.

This is a burning question right here in my congregation.

I maintain that 1 Cor. 5, 13 excludes such persons from all rights, from speaking, voting, from the Sacraments, etc., but does not necessarily exclude them from the building.

2. Must an excommunicated member remain with the same congregation after a full apology has been made and accepted if he deems it to be to his and his family's interest to join a neighboring congregation?

1. The congregation has the right to exclude from its business meetings (voters' meetings) persons who have been excommunicated.

2. It is advisable to exclude all such. The question is really not: Why should an excommunicated person be permitted to attend? But this: Why should he attend? Does the congregation derive any blessing from his presence? Is it rather not to be feared that such a one will be strengthened in his impenitence if he finds that he is still welcome to associate with the membership in its official meetings? The impression surely will be: "Matters cannot be so very desperate after all."

3. Our congregational meetings are closed meetings and not open to the public. Even brethren in the faith, members of neighboring congregations, have no right to attend unless special permission is granted. Many of the affairs treated in the congregational meetings are private and concern no one except those who are responsible for action taken — the voting members.

4. If an outsider has on one occasion or another been permitted to attend, we would not say that a sin has been

committed, but we believe that the practise permitting such visitors to attend a congregational meeting, *a fortiori* in the case of persons excommunicated, to be an unwise practise and not in accord with the purposes which our congregational meetings are to serve.

5. I can see no reason why an excommunicated member, when restored to membership through making peace with his home congregation, should be less free to join a neighboring one than members who have not been disciplined.

15. PUBLISHING A LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.

I do not believe in publishing the list of contributors, because it may cause hard feeling and uncharitable judging, as the financial situation of some member listed with a small contribution is not known and cannot be explained to all those who read the list.

Why should names and amounts be published? To show what large sums some members are giving? That may be done without mentioning names.

Or is it to show some of the members that they, as compared with others, are not giving enough? That cannot be done unless the comparative income or financial situation is likewise stated.

Is it to make some members feel ashamed of their small gifts or of the fact that they have contributed nothing? It would be contrary to brotherly love to do this in such a public way. The admonition of Christ "Tell him his fault between thee and him alone" is better than the idea of putting some one to an open shame.

Or is it simply to show each contributor that his contribution has been duly received? That may be done—as well as reminding him of any back dues—by sending him an individual statement, as my congregation does four times a year.

Is it to incite some members to greater liberality by showing them the example of others? That would amount to a real benefit even if a few of those who have given much would be induced, by seeing the small gifts of others, to give less in the future.

After all, to list the names of members and their contributions means a tremendous task, especially where members have three kinds of envelopes, weekly, synodical, and for a debt or building fund. To do justice to every member, all three items would have to be listed, requiring six columns at the least.

Our canvassers meet monthly, hear the report of the financial secretary on those who are in arrears, and are sent forth to admonish them whenever it is considered proper to do so.

Whatever may be said in favor of publishing the list, I like to refrain from it because of the danger of causing a feeling of humiliation to those who have contributed but little, whose circumstances are not known, and who will be harshly judged by the "ignorant." Let us have consideration for the feeling of the person with a small offering.

You have stated the argument against publishing the list of contributors as well as it can be stated. On a number of points I will agree with you at once. The purpose of printing these lists is not to give publicity to the large donors. Nor is it to make those feel ashamed of their small gifts who have given according to their means. Also the public acknowledgment is not a sufficient reason for these printed lists. I do not believe that any one will reduce his donations when he sees the smaller gifts of others. Finally, I agree with you that where you can have collectors or canvassers who will visit those who are in arrears and make personal inquiry after the cause, you have a system which cannot be surpassed by any amount of printed contacts.

But when all this is said, I do believe that such lists of individual contributors may be published in an evangelical spirit and may be made actually productive of enlarged and more consecrated giving.

In his printed list of a year or two ago Pastor Koenig of Holy Cross Church, St. Louis, inserted a page with the heading "How to Use This Report," which I kept because it seemed so well written. Let me quote a few paragraphs from it: "The large sums that were contributed to the Lord's work last year should fill the heart of every loyal Christian with gratitude. Willingness to give is a grace bestowed by God's Spirit. While we are thankful for this grace, we do not boast if we have received it.

"Avoid uncharitable judging. Small sums do not always mean small spirits and small love for Jesus. Before the facts have been established, 'judge not, condemn not.' In many instances careful investigation would reveal that such as gave little gave more than you.

"Let us judge only ourselves. And let us be severe with ourselves. 'Could I have given more to Him who loved me and gave Himself for me?' That should be the question. Jesus knows the answer. And so do we. Let us act accordingly.

"And finally, St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, who had expressed their readiness to take part in a collection for suffering brethren, 'Your zeal hath provoked very many.' May not the zeal of many of our members provoke others to more systematic and more liberal contributions to their Savior and His cause?"

16. "HE CAN AFFORD IT!"

I cannot agree with your somewhat slighting reference to the gift of Mr. H. Certainly "he can afford it." It is also true that he can give a thousand dollars as easily as you can give ten. In one sense it is very true that the rich

man who gives a thousand dollars for any church purpose can afford to give it. And he can afford to give \$10,000 if he has that much ready cash. And if he converts his bonds and real estate into money, he can afford to give it all, every cent. He promised to lay down his life for the Gospel if necessary; he can surely give his wealth. Some have done that. And some have given both. And it is the best investment in treasure and blood that any man can make. It is as nothing compared with the sacrifice of our Lord on Calvary.

But you do not mean that when you say, "Well, he can afford it." You mean that large gifts are not a sacrifice for a rich man. When a poor man gives \$10, he must forego some comfort; he can spend just that much less on clothing or food. The rich man can give \$1,000, and he will not sacrifice any comforts nor even deny himself a luxury. And in this sense it is true that the gifts of the poor are greater than the donations of the rich. The principle is that with God it does not count how much we give, but how much we keep for ourselves. Hence, too, he who gives his life to the preaching of the Gospel has given more than he who gives money, since he has surrendered every opportunity to become a rich man. All this is undeniably true.

And still we are apt to overlook several things when we judge the giving of our wealthy members. In the first place, earthly possessions have a strange way of increasing their hold even on the Christian's heart as these possessions begin to increase. With the possession of money there comes a growing desire to have more. One thousand dollars in the bank — at last! But when by dint of much saving that amount has been acquired, the desire to increase the first thousand to five thousand grows, and when the fifth thousand is reached, there looms the possibility of

doubling that amount once, twice, until one is "independent." And so it is true that the more we have, the greater is the temptation to hold on to it; and this is what our Lord means when He speaks of "the deceitfulness of riches." From this point of view it can be said that the wealthy who give liberally exercise a greater self-denial than the poor, since they must overcome the almost irresistible impulse to grow rich, to become "independent." And this is often overlooked.

Furthermore, we should remember that a dollar to the poor man is worth one dollar and four cents. That is as much as he can ordinarily expect to gain from its investment. If a man has \$1,000, the opportunities for increased returns are much greater, and as a man acquires more wealth, these opportunities grow, and they grow out of proportion to the amount of money added to his holdings. But turning over his capital only twice a year, his income is doubled, and it used to be a pretty poor business that did not turn over its capital three or four times a year. Hence, while the first dollar is worth one hundred and four cents, the hundred-thousandth dollar is worth \$1.25 or even \$2.00. And so, as wealth increases, it requires an ever greater effort to keep on giving somewhat in proportion to such increase.

When, therefore, our wealthy people give liberally, they are as truly an example of the Holy Spirit's sanctifying power as our poor, though it remains true that the right proportion of giving to having is more frequently found among our poor than among our rich. And it is this proportion that counts with the Lord.

VI. LITURGICAL INCIDENTS.

1. CHURCHLY CHURCHES.

It is true, of course, that one can worship God as well in an edifice built in violation of good architecture as in a church which conforms to this principle. And still, not absolutely. There is some real justification, aside from historical regards and the principles of good taste, for a churchly church-building. In worship the mind is directed to things above, and it is possible by the builder's art to remind the worshiper as he enters the house of God and as he permits his eye to rest upon its furnishings and even on its lines and proportions, of the purpose of his presence there and to aid him towards setting his mind in tune for communion with God in prayer and song. In our Lutheran Church the message of the Word in pulpit and Sacrament is the heart of our services; and it is possible so to repress this chief part of the service by means of unsuited architecture and design that the worshiper will fail to receive that impression of the solemnity of the place and the occasion which is so great a help to intelligent worship. It is difficult, in the absence of illustration and without detailed discussion of the elements of church art, to explain how the mind and spirit are affected by architecture. Yet so much ought to be plain, that, even as in the erection of buildings for secular uses, certain principles of design have become accepted because best suited for the spirit or purpose of the building, so the appearance of a church, both as to general design and interior trim and furnishings, should correspond to the purpose which it serves. Nay, the distinctively Lutheran features of our worship, as above

alluded to, ought to find expression in, or at least ought not to be contradicted by, the style in which we build our churches.

It will not do to say in defense of haphazard church-building plans that it "does not matter how we build so long as we have the true Gospel." The congregation that hires an incompetent architect and finds that a tower must be taken down because the footings were only two feet wide will refuse to be comforted by this reflection; nor will it console the congregation which is offended every Sunday by the abominable acoustics of the building or which will, so long as the structure stands, suffer from the architect's inexperience because of misplaced pillars, lack of coordination between organ loft and altar space, or insufficient exits, not to speak of faults in the heating and lighting.

Art is not a matter of size; a small church can be made to express the very highest ideals of churchly architecture. Some of the noblest examples of Gothic in Europe are small structures. Nor, let it be said, is Gothic the only style by which an effect of reverence, nobility, and beauty can be attained. Some of our congregations in Southern California are building churches in Spanish Mission style, which are not only suited to climate and surroundings, but very beautiful. More recently we have churches built in the Byzantine style (in Washington, D. C., in St. Louis, and elsewhere) which satisfy the sense of beauty as well as the needs of the congregation.

2. EXTEMPORANEOUS PRAYER.

Whether in your conferences the opening prayer shall be read from a manual or shall be spoken *ex corde* is a question that has been ventilated also in other groups — conferences, boards, institutions, etc. From the standpoint

of Lutheran practise nothing can be said against either the set form of prayer or the extemporaneous. While we together with the Roman and the Episcopalian Church are liturgical, or ritualistic, our Church is not opposed to free prayers. On the other hand, we do not agree with those who say that set forms of worship are necessarily "formalism." The main thing is not whether we have set forms of prayer or are accustomed to pray extemporaneously, but what we pray. Thank God, there are children of God in all churches, liturgical or non-liturgical, who worship the Father in spirit and in truth, reposing all their hope of being heard in the mercies of God in Christ.

But what of the distinction referred to? Can it be said that set forms of prayer are not conducive to a devout and truly prayerful attitude of the worshiper? No doubt, there are those who listlessly follow — or do not follow — the prayers which have become familiar from use in worship. However, abuse is not an argument against proper and wise use. Our Lord gave His disciples a set prayer, the Lord's Prayer, and from early days certain fixed forms, also of prayer, became a part of regular Christian worship, even as the Old Testament Church had its Book of Psalms, regularly used in Temple-worship.

On the other hand, extemporaneous prayers are not always of a higher order spiritually or more conducive to habits of devout and truly prayerful attention than those which are read from a book. Indeed, I have noted of late a very strong movement towards fixed forms of worship in the non-liturgical churches because of the faults which inhere in most of the extemporaneous praying heard in non-liturgical worship. In the introduction to a little *Pocket Manual of Prayer* recently gotten out for the Standard Publishing Company by Rev. W. B. Phillips the

author says: "Prejudice and railings against 'form' is a very poor apology for uncouth mouthings" and for the "bizarre and unwholesome prattle that has become general in this our day," which, says Mr. Phillips, "has a complete reward in the thousands of empty pews and the devitalized life of the Christian world."

Dr. Jefferson of New York recently said: "Extemporaneous prayer is a form of liberty which harbors a multitude of sins. It is often taken for granted that, because a man is given the privilege of framing each Sunday his own prayers, he holds a license to mold them on the spur of the moment. The result is that in many a church there is a type of confused and deformed prayer which is both scandalous and insufferable. Many a Christian of cultivation has been driven into a liturgical church because he could endure no longer the unkempt and boorish prayers of his pastor. Men and women of refinement cannot be led to the Throne of Grace by a man who lacerates all the nerves of taste at every step in his supplications. Prayers as well as sermons must be prepared, not necessarily in every phrase and word, but by meditation and a careful survey, first of the needs of the congregation and then the needs of the Church Universal. There was a superstition once that prepared sermons were an abomination to the Lord, inasmuch as they interfered with the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the preacher's brain and heart in the hour when he stood before the people. Happily for the world that superstition has passed away. Experience has proved that the Holy Spirit has better opportunity to work His will through a sermon which has been prepared by long and patient labors than through the flighty and rhapsodical mouthings of a preacher averse to study."

I think we should be grateful for the fine legacy of set prayers which we Lutherans have, both in our church

liturgy and in the manuals provided for home use. There are times and occasions, both in the hours of church devotion and in our closet, when the heart will find its own words, and there are other times when the Spirit with unutterable groanings brings those petitions before the throne of God for which we cannot find words. But, to quote Dr. Hoyt's *Public Worship for Non-liturgical Churches*: "While the humblest child of God may teach us how to pray, the service of the largest knowledge and the most skilful expression may be properly demanded in voicing the devotions of a people." The prayers in our *Liturgy and Agenda* satisfy this twofold condition. They are deposits of deepest spiritual knowledge and are cast in truly noble and edifying form.

3. THE LITURGICAL USE OF AMEN.

In our conference the question has been debated whether the word amen should be pronounced ay-men or ah-men. We know that it should always be sung ah-men. How should it be used in prayers? We always said ah-men at the end of prayers. And what of the usage of adding an amen to the close of hymns sung in the church service? Is it un-Lutheran?

Ah-men' is always correct, whether spoken or sung. Ay-men' is permissible in spoken prayer. Ah'-men and ay'-men are never correct. As for using the amen at the close of a hymn, I would say that it is un-Lutheran only in the sense that it has not been the custom in German Lutheran churches. We have, however, in the Augsburg Confession, Seventh Article, the guarantee that Lutherans shall never make ceremonies a condition of fellowship. Only that is un-Lutheran which is unbiblical. While, however, we should not condemn those things which are not forbidden in the Word of God, we should, on the other

hand, not try to introduce those which are contrary to custom or usage. I think you will be able to apply this to the second question raised in your letter.

4. APOSTROPHE "S."

When giving the name of a church or school, what is correct: Our Redeemer or Our Redeemer's, Our Savior or Our Savior's, Christ or Christ's?

We say Church of Our Redeemer, but not Our Redeemer Church. We say Church of our Savior, or Our Savior's Church, but not Our Savior Church. We say Christ Church without alternative.

5. PULPIT ANNOUNCEMENTS.

As my parish-work becomes more and more complex, the activities of my societies increase from year to year, and there is hardly a Sunday but I am requested to announce a meeting, giving date and place, a sale, a play, or a concert. When and where should this be done? Such announcements are at best a foreign body in the hour of worship, are they not?

Nothing surprises me more in the Sunday service than to note the continuance of this nuisance of making the church announcements from the pulpit or from the lectern. If announcements are made after the reading of Scripture, the connection of the opening service with the sermon is rudely torn. If they are made after the sermon, they are as good a means of destroying the impression of the sermon as the Evil One could devise. Because of these to me self-evident truths, I have long ago advocated the printing of a weekly bulletin containing all announcements. If the congregation is too poor to do this, let the announcements be made from the altar steps after the service, and not from the pulpit or during the service.

6. THE "OBEY" IN OUR MARRIAGE FORMULARY.

You refer to the omission of the word *obey* in the promise given by the bride, noted in the second form provided in our *Liturgy and Agenda* for the solemnizing of marriages. This is not a concession to prevailing sentiment, but is an unintentional omission. The committee in charge, Professors Dau, Graebner, and Fritz and Rev. Buchheimer, were not aware of this omission until the book was printed. This second form was taken over from the Australian Lutheran *Book of Forms*, in which, by pure inadvertence, the word *obey* is wanting in the bride's promise. You should supply the words "obey him" in the question directed to the woman. You will find that this change was made in later editions.

7. RELIGIOUS PAGEANTS.

For the past years members in the voting organization of my church have prevailed on me to permit, or at least to acquiesce in, the presentation of religious pageants, more specifically Biblical pageants, in our church proper, i. e., to create platform space for an occasion before our chancel, so that Christmas and other programs might permit of more interesting interpretation of the church, to represent Biblical characters, I suppose even the Master Himself, in a dramatic way. My position is to keep the place of worship free from anything that might make it a place other than for the ambassador and the people in worship. Of course, I have offered many reasons for my positions. And I personally find the old program idea of the children's Christmas service and of other services trite and musty; something must be done. I prefer the pageant idea in the hall rather than in the place of worship. However, some of our churches allow dramatic pageants in their church

proper, and that makes it impossible for some folks to see my point.

The liturgical character of our Church does not necessarily exclude pageants. Historically speaking, pageants owe their origin to the medieval Church, and they were invariably produced in the church-buildings. In our own Missouri Synod they have not been customary, and our conservatism is naturally and rightly opposed to innovations of this kind. However, if the question is asked whether the thing is right or wrong, I can find no Scripture against producing in church such pageants as you describe. Nor indeed do I believe that Christian sentiment is necessarily opposed to them. You say that the church-building should be reserved "for the ambassador and the people in worship." I agree with this, and a pageant given merely to satisfy the dramatic instinct has no place in church. However, if the performance is so planned and produced as to instil a spirit of worship, consecration, gratitude for divine favors, Christian stewardship, it would come even within the limits which you mention.

In 1929, at a joint meeting of the Board for Young People's Work and of the General School Board, pageants were discussed. The following resolutions were adopted: —

"1. While we do not object to pageants of the right kind, since their educational value is recognized, we are not ready at this time to recommend their general use because several matters require further study.

"2. In the mean time we recommend the following cautions: —

"a. Wherever given, pageants should be under the supervision of the local pastor.

"b. The Deity should not be portrayed.

"c. Great care should be exercised in the selection, preparation, and presentation of pageants."

To this I would add that anything that would strike the "funny-bone" of the audience is out of place in a religious pageant. I also take it for granted that only members in good standing participate and that, if an outside coach must be employed in the preparation of the affair, the coach may be mentioned in the printed program, but should not take active part in the production itself.

8. DRAMATIZING THE CHRISTMAS-STORY.

Kindly inform me whether or not the St. Louis Faculty or any other authoritative body of Synod approves of dramatizing the Christmas-story (nativity scene and kings presenting gifts), costumed in appropriate garbs, which is acted or presented in the chancel of the church.

The St. Louis Faculty has never been called upon to give an opinion on dramatizing the Christmas-story in the church sanctuary, nor is it probable that it will attempt to render an opinion on this subject, on which the Scriptures have not spoken. That being the case, how can the St. Louis Faculty or any one assume the authority of approving or disapproving? If the congregation wants that sort of thing, it may have it. The Nativity was a feature of the pageant given in St. Louis at the time of the Augsburg Quadricentennial, in which many of our pastors and several thousands of our lay people participated. I do not think that offense was taken.

9. VESTED CHOIRS.

To robe or not to robe our choir is a burning question among officers of our congregation. I am taking a stand for it, while several very prominent persons are opposing me. About a month after you attended the convention here, you wrote me that you thought our arrangement in church very suitable for a robed choir. Will you tell me some reasons why you think our choir should be robed?

I am not sure that I would take a very militant attitude in favor of robed choirs if I found a lot of good people opposing me; but I will certainly express myself in favor of the change. The robes have the purpose of placing all personality into the background and emphasizing the sacred services which is being rendered by a Christian choir. There are no valid doctrinal objections to this distinction, and there are weighty practical reasons for it. I do not, however, absolutely defend the adoption of vestments for our choirs. Liturgical features are indeed germane to the practise of Lutheranism, but I do not sponsor the introduction of liturgical practises new in our church-life unless and where there is a specific reason for them. I do hold that, where choirs are seated in full view of the congregation, as in front of the altar or on a balcony above it, they should for esthetic reasons be vested.

10. JOINING NON-LUTHERAN SINGING ORGANIZATIONS.

In our town a choral club is being organized for the production of Haendel's "Messiah" in the New Year week. The question has arisen whether my people should be permitted to join this organization. It does not seem that this constitutes an offense like that of our people's singing in sectarian churches as members of the choir. Even when the oratorio is sung, it is not performed as an act of worship. Those who participate have joined, not for the purpose of worship or for religious exercise, but in order to cultivate the art of music. What, then, is wrong about joining this new oratorio society?

I think you have pointed out the difference between joining a society which occasionally sings religious compositions and those organized by a church-body to lead in the music of the religious service. Music belongs into the category of indifferent things. In the art of music the re-

religious composition has a recognized place, even as there is religious architecture, religious sculpture, and religious painting. Some of our organists hold membership in the American Guild Organists, whose concerts are usually given in houses of worship. Again, no one here would speak of participation in a religious service, though the music and place may be religious. Like the enjoyment of religious sculpture — the Christ of Thorwaldsen (who was more Greek than Christian) — or of religious painting, — the greatest masterpieces being the work of Romanists, — so also in the case of music, which differs from these and other arts only in that it requires personal participation. And since it is an art that is cultivated regardless of its religious content and certainly (in the instances quoted) without a religious purpose, a Christian is able to participate without violating his conscience. There is a certain beauty and grandeur in religious composition which a Christian can enjoy, as he can enjoy any other branch of art which has a religious subject-matter, without identifying himself in a spiritual way either with the composition or with those who join him in its production.

The same reasoning, by the way, applies to the employment of non-Lutheran conductors, or directors, by singing societies organized by our people for the purpose of giving public recitals and programs. I cannot see that the hire (to use a somewhat harsh term) of a non-Lutheran director of choruses is in any sense different from hiring a non-Lutheran architect to build our churches or a non-Lutheran painter to decorate them. We prefer to employ Lutherans; we are not debarred from employing others. We simply make use in such cases of certain natural abilities for achieving certain outward results, even as we may use the scientific and literary labors of non-Lutherans in order to achieve results in sacred literature, public speaking, etc.

As Dr. Walther many years ago, in recommending a handbook of New Testament Greek written by a rationalist, remarked: "Even as the Israelites employed the heathen Gibeonites as hewers of wood and drawers of water, so we may employ the aids supplied by unbelievers for the sake of cultivating the field of religion."

In all activities which involve participation with non-Lutherans through a community of interest in art, as above referred to, we should be slow making rules and restrictions. We should not pronounce that unclean which pertains to the domain of Christian liberty.

On the other hand, we should not so use our liberty as to offend the brethren. It may well be that the presence of those with whom we identify ourselves in choral work, etc., is an offense to Christians on account of their evil lives or because of their pronounced antichristian habits of thought and speech. Men and women of scandalous life or such as parade their unbelief cannot be employed for such purposes without giving offense. Also, where participation in oratorio work or any other practise of the musical art jointly with "outsiders" is seen to disturb the minds of our people and to offend their sentiment, we should, in the interest of internal harmony, refrain from such participation. Peace, harmony, good feeling, among the brethren is worth more to us than the harmonies of Haydn, Mozart, and Bach.

You will notice the absence of Scriptural quotations. And precisely because I am unable to quote any text of Scripture against such activities as are here described, I refrain from submitting any rule to which there must be general consent in our Synod. However, I am personally averse to the participation of our people in religious mixed choruses and to the employment of non-Lutheran directors for our church choirs. Lutheran singing with a mixed

assembly of sectarians, Catholics, and agnostics grates on my sensibilities. True, worship is not involved. Religious belief is not involved. I am simply attending a concert. Yet the essential disharmony of uttering religious thoughts for a non-religious purpose is going to destroy even the artistic delight which one would otherwise take in the performance. As for seeing a non-Lutheran, unchristian, at least churchless individual conducting a mass chorus of Lutherans on some festival occasion, this tends to destroy much of the delight which I could otherwise derive from such singing. There is something inherently inartistic in a performance which, on the one hand, bids our souls "rejoice in the Lord" and, on the other, bids us admire the ability of a conductor whose rejoicing is applause, wages, or anything else than the Lord. But that is not the same as saying that such practises are unchristian and divisive of the Church. If you say that you "see no wrong in this," my answer is, "Neither do I." And where God's Word does not prohibit, we should be slow to speak. There are enough sins as it is. Let us not invent new ones.

11. SACRED MUSIC AND CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.

Can a member of my church sing a solo in a sectarian church? May he sing in the choir of such a church or play the organ? The general sentiment seems to be that somewhere we must draw the line. But where shall the line be drawn?

Your question is one that cannot be answered in a few words. As a matter of fact you have asked a number of questions involving different principles for their settlement. But in a measure one can group these various types of musical performances under the general head of worship. Now, it should be clear that wherever an act of worship is involved, Christians must apply those principles which

govern all worship. Whether that worship is the spoken word or any form of outward participation is immaterial. Likewise it is immaterial whether the words be spoken or sung, whether such speaking or singing is performed in chorus or by one on behalf of others and in their name. Playing the organ, the cornet, etc., as an accompaniment to the singing of a congregation or of any gathering which has a religious character is participation in, and identification with, acts of worship. Playing a solo on the violin or singing a solo number during a religious service is participation in such worship in no less degree than ushering, taking the offering, or performing any other act during, and as part of, such a service.

While I would be slow to make direct applications of Old Testament principles and regulations to New Testament customs of worship, one cannot altogether overlook the fact that those who participated in the Temple-worship were the children of the Covenant, and these only. If others would take part, of non-Jewish descent, they had to enter into the Covenant through Circumcision. When Jeroboam "made Israel to sin" by a mixed worship (Jehovah being adored under the image of golden calves), that king was particularly blamed because he instituted a ceremonial worship, with singing and instruments, contrary to the way which God had appointed, 1 Kings 13, 33; Amos 4; also 5, 21—27.

In the New Testament sacred music is approved as a feature of Christian worship. "Be filled with the Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," Eph. 5, 18—20. This text plainly says that worship is acceptable when performed through the power of the Spirit to God

the Father in the name of Jesus Christ. It is to be "in spirit and in truth," John 4, 24. To be "filled with the Spirit" means to possess the knowledge of salvation and to accept all that God has taught us regarding His holy and gracious will. To "make melody and speak in spiritual songs in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" can mean nothing else than expressing our faith and joy in His holy Word. There is no room here for any participation in the musical features of congregations or religious gatherings which stand, wholly or in part, on any other foundation than that which was laid by the apostles and prophets. From such and similar texts we are permitted to conclude that participation through song or any form of musical accompaniment in the worship of those who in any point antagonize God's truth is as great a wrong as mixed worship and prayer which does not involve the element of music.

All other things left aside, it reveals a very unbrotherly frame of mind when persons insist upon consorting with churches outside of their own fellowship, conducting or embellishing their worship, in the face of grave offense taken by their own brethren and sisters in the Lord, with pastor and committees pleading that they cease such connections. Of the three or four cases which have come under my notice the persons guilty of such conduct had either given other cause for offense by their "liberal" inclinations or pleaded that they could sell their gifts for money wherever they chose.

12. CHURCH CHOIR PRACTISES FOR SECULAR ENTERTAINMENT DURING LENT.

Should a church choir practise for a secular entertainment during the season of Lent? Last year my choir did this and even neglected to sing in church on Good Friday,

Palm Sunday, and Easter. This year the choir is going to sing on these festivals, but will practise during Lent for an entertainment to be given soon after Easter.

The question of observing the closed seasons is not one of doctrine or of divine command, but of church custom and Christian sentiment. It is possible to argue the question, of course, on the basis of offense given, but it must be shown that the offense is one in the Scriptural sense (causing others to err from the faith). It is well to inform the congregation of prevailing Christian custom and to stress these, without, however, neglecting mention of Christian liberty in such matters. Then let the congregation decide.

13. A FUNCTION OF USHERS.

I have read your "Instructions to Ushers." One thing I miss in this list of duties — some direction as to the seating of worshipers. The people of our Synod have a strange way of filling up the rear seats and leaving vacant the pews nearest the pulpit and altar. As you see it from your pulpit, the audience consists first of some ten or twenty oak pews, then a sprinkling of people, with a majority of the audience crowded into the seats nearest the entrance. This, of course, is all wrong. Let your ushers keep count of the number of empty pews out in front, get the average of this number, and then purchase a good stout colored silk or cotton cord, make four lengths, and by means of these cords eliminate the proportionate number of pews from use by the worshipers. Have these cords removed only when the rest of the church is filled.

Why worry about this detail? Because a church which displays to every person present the amount of vacant space is bad psychology for everybody, especially for the chance visitor or missionary prospect. I have actually attended services in a church which had the bulk of their

audience seated under the balcony. On the other hand, I have seen usher staffs that were able to make an audience of 150, through judicious distribution, appear like 300. The other extreme, let me call it, a nadir of usher inefficiency, is found where the usher stood in the aisle facing the entrance in such a manner as to actually block the aisle, so that no worshiper was able to reach the front pews at all. Filling up the church from the rear to the front, you understand, — exactly the opposite of what an usher ought to do.

This is a trifle, of course. But church-life is made up of trifles, and church-life is not a trifle.

P. S.

A volume of letters should have a *post scriptum*. Here it is.

The reader is now in a position to appreciate the reference, in my introductory note, to the limitations which I recognize in the treatment of some of the topics with which these letters deal. No "pastoral theology" is intended. Questions and problems arise that are somewhat unique, and the reader will hardly be tempted, for that reason, to make any major generalizations. Does he find himself at variance with some of the advice given? That is a privilege which we have, you and I, in matters not regulated or decided by the Scriptures. Orthodox theologians, entire faculties, have issued opinions not consonant in their decisions in matters of church-life and -work; and those who disagree with me as to the best solution of one or the other problem here treated will not feel under correction or, on the other hand, be roused to resentment. The imprint, let me say, of Concordia Publishing House and faculty censorship are not to be understood as constituting an "official" acceptance of every view propounded, as little as we are bound by the views expressed on adiaphora in other works published by our house or in our official organs. These matters are self-evident to all of us who accept the position of the Augsburg Confession and our other symbols on the so-called "indifferent things," but are here restated so as to preserve the cordial understanding which exists, I trust, between the Lutheran reader and

THE AUTHOR.